BULLETIN OF
THE JOHN RYLANDS
LIBRARY
MANCHESTER

EDITED
BY THE
LIBRARIAN

VOL. 31 DECEMBER, 1948 No. 2

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Trustees and Governors of the Library record with deep regret the death of Henry Guppy, their Librarian for almost fifty years. His death occurred on Wednesday, the 4th of August, 1948, and the funeral, conducted by the Rev. Harold Clarke, took place on the Saturday following at the Manchester Crematorium.

DR. HENRY GUPPY, C.B.E.

Among those present, in addition to family mourners, were the full body of the Council of Governors and Staff of the Library; representatives of the Trustees of the Library, of the Lord Mayor, of the Bishop of Manchester, of the University, including its Librarian, and of the Manchester Libraries Committee, including the Chairman and City Librarian; Chetham's Librarian; leading booksellers of the City, the Library bookbinder and distinguished citizens and friends.

A special meeting of the Council, in full assembly, was held on the 16th of August, principally to pay homage to the late Librarian. We reprint the following extract from the Council Minutes:

"The Chairman (Sir John Stopford) said they were met together to pay tribute to an old and dear friend as well as a great Librarian. They would all be conscious of the vacant chair occupied for so long and so worthily by Dr. Guppy, and it was a matter for great regret that he had not lived to complete fifty years of service. In a very real sense it could be said that he had made the John Rylands Library, which, though famous from its inception, had been developed into a real working library for scholars and students, as well as a place of pilgrimage by reason of its notable acquisitions of literary and artistic treasures.

Through the lectures instituted early in the Library's career, through the BULLETIN, now in its thirty-first volume, and in many other ways, Dr. Guppy has added greatly to the prestige of the Library. In conclusion Sir John expressed his admiration for the late Librarian's business acumen, his boundless energy, and his very human qualities of heart and head. Sir John felt sure they would all prefer to think of Dr. Guppy as they first knew him, a vital man and a charming personality."

Mr. Brown, the Honorary Secretary, added his tribute. He said that he had known Dr. Guppy for forty years and had come to esteem and admire him more and more. Alluding to his great qualities he applied to Dr. Guppy the noble words of Bunyan: "The Pilgrim they laid in a large upper Chamber, whose window opened towards the Sun rising; the name of the Chamber was Peace, where he slept till break of day; and then he awoke and sang. . . ."

Sir John added that he had requested Professor Charlton, the Governor with the longest term of service, twenty-one years, to write the official Resolution of Sympathy to be embodied in the Minutes.

Professor Charlton said he would content himself with reading the resolution:—

"Well-knowing that no formal resolution can pay adequate tribute to the services which Henry Guppy rendered to the Library, its Governors wish simply to record their grief at his death and their sense of the personal and public loss occasioned by it. For forty-nine years he lived for the Library, devoting to it the massive strength of his person and of his character. He felt that to serve the Library was a solemn vocation, and to every form of his service he brought the dignity and the grand manner which instinct suggested to him as fitting to his office. He saw himself as custodian, not only of priceless volumes, but of inexhaustible sources of the wisdom by which the spirit of man is sustained. His pride in unique incunabula or in a perfect Caxton was not mere pride of possession: it was joy in still further opportunity for extending the dominion of man's mind. Scholars, from tyros to pundits, in Eastern or Western hemisphere, were bidden to avail themselves of the wealth of the

John Rylands. Every device for making these resources widely accessible was explored, and Manchester achieved its place on the cultural map of the world. The achievement was due as much to Henry Guppy's personality as to his professional accomplishments. A great institution himself, he never ceased to be a very human being. Mrs. Rylands founded the John Rylands Library ; Henry Guppy made it ; indeed, for forty-nine years Henry Guppy was the John Rylands Library."

The resolution was unanimously approved and the Council paid standing tribute to Dr. Guppy's memory. A copy of the resolution was ordered to be forwarded to Mrs. Guppy and to Mrs. Wood, surviving daughter of Dr. Guppy.

The Assistant-Secretary added a few words on behalf of the Staff. They had all been proud to serve under Dr. Guppy, and his capacity for work and his inspiring example had been a great stimulus to everyone, but what endeared him most to those under him was the great generosity he showed in his private life, and the certainty that anyone in trouble could not find a better friend : a great and good man.

The frontispiece has already appeared in the special volume of the BULLETIN ' In Honour of Henry Guppy ' published in 1941, a Festschrift presented to him on his completion of forty years as Librarian and to which distinguished Librarians, Governors, Staff and others contributed. The original portrait was presented by the Trustees and Governors to Dr. Guppy, and by him to the Library ; it is displayed in perpetuity in the Council Chamber. It represents Dr. Guppy as all who knew him wish to remember him.

Through the courtesy of *The Manchester Guardian* and *The Times* we are permitted to print the following obituaries :

" We regret to announce the death, at the age of 86, of Dr. Henry Guppy, for forty-nine years librarian of the John Rylands Library, Manchester. He died at his home at Buxton after a short illness.

" Henry Guppy was born in London on 31st December, 1861. Still a youth, he left the City of London School for employment with a firm of educational publishers. Soon afterwards his appointment as sub-librarian of Sion College Library determined

the course of his life's work. In June, 1899, he came to Manchester as joint librarian with Edward Gordon Duff (who had been appointed by Mrs. Rylands in 1893) to the new John Rylands Library, four months before it was opened. Duff resigned in 1900, and from that date Guppy was John Rylands Librarian. Honours came in due course: Litt.D. (Manchester), D.Phil. et Litt. (Louvain), and C.B.E.

"Such a record may seem to suggest a life given to the cloistered seclusion of academic bibliophily, aloof from the highways of public interest. But in fact, and amongst other things, Guppy was one of the builders of Manchester. If civic merit be measured by the spreading of Manchester's honoured name throughout the world, Guppy was one of our foremost citizens. East and west, north and south, there are many, and they not the least important in their own lands, who know Manchester only by its John Rylands Library; and the library was in literal truth made by Guppy.

"But it is not only in this grand and global style that Guppy's civic service is to be reckoned. Like so many adopted Mancunians of an earlier generation, he was zealous for the public good. Besides organising professional help for recruits in municipal libraries he sought, by exhibitions, lectures, and articles, to foster and gratify the interests of typical groups of Manchester's citizens. He led them to see and feel books not as dead things but as vital powers in the growth of the spirit of men. In particular, he made the life story of the English Bible a vivid chapter in the tale of English liberalism and independence.

"The pattern to which he shaped the John Rylands Library made it a shrine of theology and the humanities. Its custodian dispensed its immense reserves no less eagerly to earnest young students than to world-famed pundits; for all were, in his and the true sense, scholars. With an impressive dignity and a warm sympathy, a practical acumen and a sense of ideal values, a faith in learning and a trust in his own strength, his personality marked all he did. His character made him one of the great librarians of our time; it made Manchester's John Rylands one of the historic libraries of the world. Guppy lived for it by solemn dedication. His memorial is the library itself, its publications,

its BULLETIN, and the gratitude and affection of all who came to his library in search of knowledge and of wisdom.

"Guppy's capacity for work was immense, and only equalled by his enthusiasm in his calling. And both were put to their greatest strain when, in 1914, after the destruction of the library of the University of Louvain the Governors of the Rylands, at his suggestion, made the first gift of 200 volumes towards the rebuilding of the collection and undertook the custody, registering, and forwarding of any other gifts. This action led to the formation in 1916 of a national committee, co-operating with the Rylands, and over 50,000 volumes were presented to Louvain, all of which passed through the hands of Dr. Guppy and his staff.

"In the general field of the library profession Guppy was the first editor of the official journal of the Library Association, was one of the founders and first president of its North Central Branch, and before that was a president of the North-western Branch, becoming the president of the parent association in 1926." (*The Manchester Guardian.*)

"Dr. Henry Guppy, C.B.E., who died at the age of 86 on Wednesday, had been for almost half a century an important figure in Manchester as librarian of the John Rylands Library, but he was a Londoner by birth and education.

"The son of Henry Guppy, he was born on 31st December, 1861, and educated at the City of London School; after a time in a publisher's office he made his entry into his profession by way of the Sub-Librarianship at Sion College. Mrs. John Rylands had founded the library named after her husband in 1888 with the primary intention of helping further study for the Methodist ministry, in which Rylands had been deeply interested, but from the beginning the wise principle of adding the arts to the central section of theology was followed. The building, an elaborate erection in modern Gothic, designed by Basil Champneys, was begun in 1890, showing the scale of the foundress's ambition, which had its first great opportunity two years later, when she bought the famous Althorp Library from Lord Spencer, while the Ashburnham and Phillipps sales in the same decade yielded many manuscripts of the first quality. The first librarian to be appointed to take charge of the new library was the celebrated

bibliographer Edward Gordon Duff, whose work on the priceless and rapidly growing collection should never be forgotten. The building was finished and the library opened in 1899, and in this year Guppy was brought from Sion College to be joint librarian with Duff. The latter, a sensitive Highlander, who had never been *persona grata* with Mrs. Rylands, retired two years later, confining himself thenceforward to peripatetic bibliography, and from that time the library was under Guppy's sole charge. He threw himself into his task and opportunity with enthusiasm, which rapidly embraced the city at large.

" The Althorp purchase remains the greatest single acquisition of the library but many acquisitions made after 1899 would have rendered any librarian's term of office remarkable. In 1901 came the 6,000 manuscript volumes (including many in Oriental tongues) from the *Bibliotheca Lindesiana* of the Earls of Crawford, and a few years later Mrs. Rylands's own valuable library from Longford Hall, and these were followed by many others ; quite recently the present Lord Crawford deposited in the Rylands, to preserve its unity, a large and valuable section of the *Bibliotheca Lindesiana*, with which he was compelled to part. Later developments were ancient tablets from the Near East and historical papers and deeds relating to the North of England. Handling and organizing historical and literary monuments of such quality, Guppy greatly developed as a scholar and bibliographer, though he was primarily the cause of scholarship in others, his own publications being mostly slight and occasional, except for what he edited rather than wrote—a massive exception. But in his earlier years he had compiled the catalogues of the Port Royal Collection in the Sion College Library, and of the bibles in St. Paul's Cathedral, and two volumes of the catalogue of the Proclamations in the *Bibliotheca Lindesiana*, this last before he had migrated to Lancashire.

" No one man could in any case be a master of the whole range of the collections. Guppy showed a flair for securing the services of experts, either as assistants or as consultants, and he was ready to catch ideas for the development of the library from scholars holding posts in the University of Manchester, many of whom were governors of the library. His capacity for enlisting the gifts of outside scholars, and conversely of rendering the library

of more value to them, was perhaps best displayed by his foundation, so early as 1908, and his editorship for the rest of his life, of the substantial BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, which provided print and paper for the regular lectures in the library (and largely upon subjects represented in it) of which he had also been the chief founder.

"Outside the John Rylands and Manchester Guppy showed equal energy and industry. From 1899 to 1903 he edited the *Library Association Record*, and in 1926 he served his term as the association's president. But perhaps he was most roused by the fate of the library of Louvain University in the 1914-18 war. To its restoration he devoted himself from 1914 onwards. A doctorate of Louvain and the Medaille du roi Albert were appropriate honours earned by this work. The destruction of this second library, in some sense his child, in the 1939-45 war, was naturally a severe blow to him. Guppy outlived all his contemporaries, not merely in years, but in length of service. Twenty and more years after most professional men have sought superannuation or had superannuation thrust upon them he was daily at his desk, answering his letters in his own firm handwriting, determined to be Librarian to the last." (*The Times.*)

The Governors have further to record with great regret the death of Lewis Whittaker, F.L.A., Assistant-Librarian, at the untimely age of forty years. Whittaker, who joined the staff in 1926, has rendered great services to the Library. He served with distinction in the late war, and we deplore the tragic ending of a career rich in promise. We mourn the loss not only of an efficient and loyal servant, but also of a man who endeared himself to colleagues and readers alike by reason of his character and lovable personality.

LEWIS WHITTAKER, F.L.A.

The present number consists of five of the lectures delivered during the session 1947-48 by well-known contributors to these pages, an article by Mr. C. E. Pickford on one of our outstanding French MSS., and a survey of the Library's important collection of manorial and similar records by Dr. F. Taylor, Keeper of Manuscripts.

CURRENT ARTICLES.

MENANDER: PLAYS OF ADVENTURE AND SATIRE.[1]

By T. B. L. WEBSTER, M.A., F.S.A.
PROFESSOR OF GREEK, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

I. Introduction.

THE plays of Reconciliation and the plays of Social Criticism form two main groups of Menander's plays. The other plays of which something is known may be classified as Adventure (or Intrigue) plays and Single Character plays. Although the grouping does not pretend to be chronological, it is worth noting that of the six plays which can be dated after 304 B.C. five are plays of Social Criticism and one is a play of Reconciliation, while all the Adventure and Single Character plays that can be dated appear, for one reason or another, to have been written before 304 B.C. and nine of them can confidently be placed in the first ten years of Menander's production.[2] These plays are therefore the best guide to Menander's art in his early years when he was still writing in the tradition of the Middle Comedy, although the beginnings of the more serious Menander can already be seen.

Four of these plays (*Apistos* = *Aulularia*, *First Adelphoi* = *Stichus*, *Dis Exapaton* = *Bacchides*, *Karchedonios* = *Poenulus*) survive in Plautine adaptations; considerable papyrus fragments have been recovered of five (*Samia*, *Heauton Penthon* = *Comoedia Florentina*, *Kolax*, *Koneiazomenai*, *Perinthia*); the *Hiereia* is known from an epitome probably of the first century A.D.; of the rest nothing remains but short fragments of the Greek originals and of Roman adaptations. The original of Plautus'

[1] An amplification of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 14th of January, 1948.

[2] *Samia* and *Pseudherakles* (very early); *Apistos*, *Dis Exapaton*, *Kekryphalos* (soon after 317 B.C.); *First Adelphoi*, *Karchedonios* (before 312 B.C.); *Kolax* (312 B.C. or soon after); *Paidion* probably 311 B.C. (I.G.^{2} 2323a). Note that the likeness of 249K from the late *Encheiridion* to *Samia* 269 only shows that in that play also a father had a mistaken suspicion; the likeness need go no further.

Truculentus certainly had some resemblance to Menander's *Thais* (see Appendix). The detailed problems of restoration are discussed below or have already been discussed.

Certain of these plays belong together. Enough is known of the *Dyskolos* to show that it was very like the *Apistos* and the fragments suggest that the *Deisidaimon* and *Misogynes* were character studies of the same kind. Demeas in the *Samia* is an elderly man of a different type who cannot be summed up in a single adjective. The old miser in the *Thesauros* and the father in the *Hiereia* seem to have been the most important characters of those plays, and the *First Adelphoi* is dominated by the old man Antipho's reactions first to the sisters' loyalty and then to the brothers' wealth; for these reasons these plays are reckoned as the Single Character plays. In the *Demiourgos*, *Paidion*, and *Thais* (perhaps also in the *Parakatatheke* and *Phanion*, of which little remains), the chief character was a hetaira.

The Adventure or Intrigue plays can be divided into two main groups, intrigues against a father and intrigues against a *leno*. The *Karchedonios* and *Kolax* are intrigues against a *leno*, probably also the *Aspis* and *Thrasyleon*.[1] In the *Dis Exapaton*, *Heauton Penthon*, *Perinthia*, *Koneiazomenai* the intrigue is directed against the father, probably also in the *Arrhephoros* and the *Pseudherakles*, since in both the girl evidently has a child and therefore the intrigue is likely to be directed against the father of the girl or of the young man.

II. Traditional Comedy.

The comedy of intrigue and the single character play have themselves ancestors in Middle Comedy. A third kind of comedy, the comedy of the dominant idea, which derives from Aristophanes,[2] also influenced Menander. Just as Aristophanes' *Plutus* shows the results on various sorts of people of making Wealth see, so in the *First Adelphoi* Menander shows the effects

[1] *Sikyonios* offers no clue but is included here because it is a soldier play. *Kekryphalos* had intrigue (279K) and recognition. Other recognition plays: *Daktylios*, *Karine*, *Knidia*, perhaps also *Didymai*, *Hydria*, *Messenia*, *Olynthia*. *Epangellomenos* also had an intrigue.

[2] Cf. Rylands Bulletin, XXIX, 151 f.

on Antipho, Gelasimus, and the slaves of making the brothers rich. In rather the same way, the *Apistos* (and perhaps also the *Dyskolos*) is a study of the effect of sudden wealth on a thrifty peasant whom it converts into a miser, but in this play the effect is confined to a single character and his psychology is Menander's chief interest. It is also justifiable to see a survival of Aristophanes' 'wittiest conceptions' in the special situations which Menander introduces early in his plays and which, to some extent, determine the course of the play. Aristophanes' conceptions are essentially fantastic and impossible, 'the man who fetched a tragic poet from the Underworld' or 'the man who made a private peace'; the situations which Menander invents for the starting point of his comedies are not impossible, if unusual; an obvious instance is the shearing of Glykera, which gives the *Perikeiromene* its name. In the plays under discussion, further instances may be seen in the introduction of Moschion's baby into Demeas' house in the first act of the *Samia*, which is the cause of all the trouble, and presumably the women's threat to take hemlock in the *Koneiazomenai*.

To the same class of 'witty conceptions', though with a more limited effect on the plot, belong the more extravagant deceptions concocted by slaves. The feigned death prescribed for Chaireas in the *Heauton Penthon* and the feigned 'possession' of the slave in the *Hiereia* show that there is no need to suspect the invention of Plautus in the fabricated tale of Ephesian robbers,[1] the dictated letter, and the prearranged tableau of the *Dis Exapaton* or in the dressing up of the bailiff in the *Karchedonios*. The same sort of extravagant comedy appears in the scenes of misunderstanding: in the *Apistos* Euclio and Lyconides are at cross purposes for a whole scene before Euclio realises that Lyconides is talking about his daughter and not about the stolen gold (*Aul.* 727 f.), and in the *Hiereia* the father identified the wrong boy as his son and then the right boy refused to accept him as father.[2]

[1] Cf. with *Bacch.* 251 ff. *Arrhephoros* 67K, which should belong to a similar intrigue, *Halieis* 15K; perhaps also *Naukleros* 348K, but there the situation may be a return without intrigue as in the *Kitharistes* and *Synaristosai*. The "Bogus Herakles" is presumably an impersonation.

[2] Cf. also in the *Synaristosai* where Gymnasium is twice mistaken for Selenium.

Boisterous knockabout in the tradition of fifth century comedy is also more common in Menander's earlier plays. Three such scenes, which have an Aristophanic ancestry, are banter between master and slave (e.g. *Sam.* 325 f.), contest between slaves (e.g. *Poen.* 851 f.), and the siege scene in the *Kolax* (*Eun.* 771 f.). The slave and the donkey in the opening scene of Aristophanes' *Frogs* are recalled by a fragment which may also belong to the *Kolax* (534K, cf. *Kol.* 32). Middle Comedy audiences evidently greatly enjoyed feasting on the stage, and this tradition also survives in the slave banquet at the end of the *First Adelphoi*.[1] The violent punishment of slaves,[2] the grumbling arrival of the *advocati* (*Poenulus*) and the quarrels between old men and cooks are in the same tradition. Menander particularly liked the comedy of running in and out of houses, exemplified in the *Apistos* by Euclio in his first scene with Megadorus (*Aul.* 202, 243).[3] Much of this kind of boisterous comedy depends on acting for its effect, but we can appreciate well enough the enchanting situation when Euclio is trying to hide his pot of gold; he sees Megadorus and knows that he cannot escape him; he probably puts the pot on the ground; that is why he looks so strange and slovenly (536-539) and remains rooted to the ground so that Megadorus finally has to leave him there (579). Megadorus' tirade against women with dowries has an added piquancy for the audience who know that Euclio has the bride's dowry with him in the pot (cf. 26).

III. Satire.

Earlier comedy provided Menander with satirical sketches of traditional characters: hetairae who ruined their lovers, boastful soldiers, parasites and flatterers, miserly old men and stern fathers, as well as minor figures such as bibulous nurses and midwives and the loathly *leno*. My purpose here is not to trace their ancestry but to notice how far Menander uses them in the early plays and where he crosses the borderline from satire to

[1] Drinking scenes also occurred on the stage in the *Synaristosai* (451, 455), *Pallake* (377K), *Kekryphalos* (273K), *Kolax* (292K).

[2] See J. J. Tierney, *P.R.I.A.*, L (C), 54.

[3] Cf. *Samia* 202, 218; 318, 325, 336; *Perik.* 108-127; *Heauton.* 502, 558.

sympathy. We can see something of the transition in these plays, but the full portraits of sympathetic hetairae and soldiers are found in the plays of reconciliation and social criticism. Gelasimus, the unfortunate parasite of the *First Adelphoi*,[1] who is spurned by his friends when they have become rich and leaves the stage intending suicide, is only introduced to raise derisive laughter; though much Romanised by Plautus, he belongs to a tradition which goes back to Eupolis and Epicharmus. Gnatho in the *Kolax* scorns the old-fashioned jester like Gelasimus (*Eun.* 244-247); he is characterised by Daos as the new type of flatterer and so behaves to the soldier, Bias; but Kuiper[2] has made a very good case for supposing that his chief object is to help the youthful Pheidias and that therefore he is the first sympathetic parasite.

Bias in the *Kolax* is the typical soldier,[3] full of extravagant boasts; there is no reason to suppose that Menander treated him with any sympathy but he may have shifted the emphasis somewhat in the *Thais*; according to Propertius one of her victims was the *miles non factus amori* (cf. Menander, 732K: 'a soldier could not be elegant even if god were to fashion him'). This type of soldier appears in the *Truculentus*; Stratophanes rather self consciously suppresses the exuberance of self-praise (482). He spends his wealth ungrudgingly on Phronesium, whom he regards as his wife and believes to have borne him a son; she, however, is only concerned to extract the maximum of money from him and has pretended to be a mother for this sole purpose. For her he is simply a convenience, an uncultured brute; and it is in this sense, i.e. from the hetaira's point of view, that the soldier of the *Thais* was not 'made for love'. Stratophanes is not represented sympathetically; he is a figure of fun, but a slight change of emphasis would make him into a sympathetic character; he represents an intervening stage

[1] Kock (III, 676) notes the parallel between 632-640 and Alciphron, III, 49, which shows that the substratum is Menander. In 195K (*Ephesios*) a parasite (?) expects to be sold as a slave.

[2] *Mnem.*, 1938, 165 f.

[3] The soldier in the *Sikyonios* had also only recently made his money; the wild soldier in the *Thrasyleon* was probably like Bias as the plays seem to have run on similar lines. The soldiers in the *Karchedonios* and *Kolax* are slight sketches.

between Bias of the *Kolax* and Thrasonides of the *Misoumenos*, who is also 'hated' by his girl but finally wins her affection.

Phronesium in the *Truculentus* is a full portrait of the hetaira who is only interested in money and accepts or rejects lovers by their momentary ability to give, like the hetaira of the *Demiourgos* who 'knew a young man for her own profit' and 'stripped him bare' (Ribbeck, 90, IV, V). Phronesium's door, like Thais', only opens if the visitor has money (Propertius, IV, v. 46; *Truc.* 95 f.). She scorns the soldier's gifts like the hetaira in the *Paidion*, who complains that a gold necklace, which has been given to her, is not set with gems (372-373K, *Truc.* 530 f.). In the *Thais*, as in the *Truculentus*, the hetaira evidently dominated the play and the chief theme was satire of her greed. The two Bacchides in the *Dis Exapaton*, though they only appear at the beginning and end of the play, are entirely mercenary and ruthless in their capture of the old men and their sons. These hetairae correspond to the conventional picture drawn by the fathers in the plays of Social Criticism.[1]

The old men, of whom fathers form the largest group, are satirised for various characteristics; they interfere with other people's business (particularly Smikrines in the *Heauton Penthon*); many of them are mean, if not actually misers; Knemon of the *Dyskolos* was the type of irritability and bad temper. 'Close-fisted' (*philargyros*), 'irritable' (*dyskolos*), 'suspicious' (*apistos*) are three adjectives naturally applied to those who have not inherited wealth but have suddenly found it or come by it; sometimes one, sometimes another of these qualities is dominant; the whole tenor of Euclio's behaviour in the *Aulularia*[2] shows that his dominant characteristic, while he possesses the gold, is *apistia*; for this reason he confides the gold to *Pistis* (583 f.), and these suspicions have given him no peace night or day (65, 72, fr. IV). He had peace in the old days when he dug his land (fr. III) and he finds peace again when he is rid of the gold (fr. IV): as has been noted,[3] the position is admirably illustrated

[1] The contrast between conventional judgment and reality noted there can also be seen in the *Samia* where Demeas treats loyal and faithful Chrysis as a conventional hetaira (121 f., 175 f.).

[2] E.g. 41, 60, 90 f., 110, 188, 437, 551, 574, 628 f.

[3] Pokrowski, *Wiener Studien*, xlix, 128 f.

by a remark of Epicurus : ' For many the acquirement of wealth does not end their troubles, but changes them.' In the view of the slave Strobilos, Euclio is also ' close-fisted ' (300, as interpreted by Choricius).[1]

Antipho in the *First Adelphoi* is perhaps the least attractive of all Menander's old men. He has a reputation for virtue (*Stich.* 12) like other mean men. His meanness is clear (555) ; he wants his daughters married off to rich husbands (132 cf. Papyrus Didot), because money creates friends (522) ; and he drives his servants to get more work out of them (58). Less amiable qualities are his refusal to act on his own authority (128), his pretence that he wants a wife when in fact he wants a hetaira (109 f., 545 f.), and his fawning subservience to his sons-in-law because they are rich. These are qualities of the Dissembler and Self-seeking Affable in Theophrastus. Antipho's desire for a hetaira is matched by the speedy capitulation of the two old men in the *Dis Exapaton*.[2]

They at first sight resemble the pair in the *Second Adelphoi* ;[3] Philoxenus has the same theory of education as Micio, although unlike Micio he has a wild youth behind him (410, cf. *Kith.* 53), and Nicobulus has the meanness of Demea (230, 324, 1184), but the play shows little sympathy for either. Is the difference due to Plautus and Terence or to Menander ? It can also be seen in the other characters ; here Pistoclerus is allowed to fall hopelessly in love with a hetaira and Mnesilochus has no hope of conventional happiness in marriage ; Bacchis has none of the redeeming features of Thais in the *Eunuch.* Fraenkel has shown that Plautus has greatly increased the part of the slave Chrysalus and argues that he has done this at the expense of other characters : ' the Attic elements in this play, which in some places are very faithfully preserved, as well as the analogy of the

[1] Note, however, that in the *Heautontimoroumenos* 526, Syrus much more unjustly describes Menedemus as *avidum . . . atque aridum.* Enk has made a good case for calling Euclio ' thrifty ' rather than ' close-fisted ', *Mnemosyne*, 1935, 84.

[2] Cf. also the father of Alcesimarchus in the *Synaristosai* (*Cist.* 305) : 235-237K (*Thesauros*), 509K (*Chalkeia*).

[3] Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 242 ; Wehrli, *Motivstudien*, 79 f. ; compare particularly *Bacch.* 417 with *Ad.* 107 f. ; *Bacch.* 1052 with *Ad.* 50 f. ; cf. also *Bacch.* 411 (Lydus) with *Ad.* 988 (Demea).

Adelphi translated by Terence, make it certain that Menander's real interest in this play was the educational problem (in its widest sense) or, to be more precise, not the problem but the stretch of life, lived in the sphere of and under the influence of definite moral forces, which the poet views from the standpoint of *paideia*.'[1] It is however possible that Menander's real interest was the two deceits of the slave, which gave the play its name, and that his character-drawing was light and satirical. Lydus' praise of the Old Education is not to be taken too seriously: he cannot show his charge how to deal with temptation when it arises,[2] and his wish picture of Mnesilochus (457 f. cf. 1084 f.) bears little relation to the facts. If all the Plautine expansion and colouring is removed, the slave still remains a dominant figure, but Daos in the *Heauton Penthon* and the *Perinthia* must have been equally important.[3] The *Dis Exapaton* seems to me to be primarily boisterous comedy, secondly satire on the hetairae and the old men. For the young men Menander shows a flicker of sympathy which foreshadows the plays of Social Criticism, but this must not be exaggerated.[4] Similarly, there is no reason to suppose that Menander was greatly interested in the young man of the *Karchedonios*. The girls are nicely contrasted but slightly drawn, and Wilamowitz[5] goes too far in finding 'tragic tension' here. I doubt if Agorastocles would understand the 'even worse danger that the lover might buy his beloved as a hetaira and so damage himself, because he ought to marry her in whom he already half unconsciously feels his wife.'

[1] See below (Sect. VI) for Kuiper's wholesale reconstruction with the same intent.

[2] Alciphron, IV, 2, 3: 'even the most strait-laced could hardly keep his hand off Bacchis' seems to be a reminiscence of the original of *Bacch.* 111 (Leo, *Pl. F.*, 1139).

[3] Note that in both plays an earlier unguarded remark by the slave (*Bacch.* 326; *Perinthia* 393K) is later quoted against him by his master (*Bacch.* 775; *Perinthia* pap. fr. 13).

[4] We have too little of Moschion in the *Samia* and Pheidias in the *Kolax* to say how they were handled. The young man in the *Thais* was completely enslaved to the hetaira; so also the youth in the *Demiourgos*, who, like Diniarchus in the *Truculentus*, apparently only married the girl whom he had violated when he was threatened with legal proceedings.

[5] *N. Jbb.*, 1899, 519 = *Kl. Schr.*, I, 232.

Menander seems to me to have set himself here, too, the more obvious task of writing a good comedy with an extravagant intrigue and an interesting recognition.

IV. Positive Values.

Much of Menander's satire is directed against wrong values. The wrong value put on money by old men, *lenos*, and hetairae, who rate it higher than human relationships, and by soldiers, who think it can buy human relationships, is obvious, but parasites and the old and young men who fall for hetairae show another kind of wrong value, the excessive estimation of temporary physical pleasure. The other side is put most clearly by the sisters in the *First Adelphoi*, particularly by Pamphila, who plays Antigone to her sister's Ismene :[1] 'to my mind it is right that all who are wise should do their duty' (39); 'I like my beggar; I feel no differently from him now he is poor than I did before when he was rich' (133). 'Where is there so much money, father, which would give me more joy than my husband? How is it either just or honourable for me to share the good things he had and not to share his difficulties?' (Pap. Didot a. 22). Here alone in this play we see the Menander of, e.g. the Pamphile-Charisios scenes in the *Epitrepontes*, elsewhere his seriousness is concealed in satire. But we can point to other instances of positive values in this group of plays.

Demeas in the *Samia* judges too hastily on the evidence that Moschion's baby is also Chrysis' baby and deduces unjustifiably that Chrysis is responsible, but the decision which he reaches is an attempt to judge his son dispassionately without reference to his own suffering but on the basis of his son's character and past life. He applies the Aristotelian discrimination between types of crime although it costs him his whole personal happiness (135, 'forget your desire, be through with love'). However mistakenly, he is trying to act by a higher standard just as his earlier decision to recognise and rear Chrysis' baby, when he thinks it

[1] Perhaps the brothers were similarly contrasted: Gelasimus appears to distinguish Epignomus as the harder of the two (399, 605) and Epignomus has perhaps reached a truer sense of values (410 f.).

is his own, puts him above the conventional morality of Nikeratos, who dubs him 'soft'.

In the *Karchedonios* Lycus and Hanno are more seriously conceived than the rest. Here the forces for evil and good, which govern the lives of Agorastocles and Adelphasium, are contrasted. The idea which contrasts them is *eusebeia*, reverence towards the gods and the gods' reward for reverence. Lycus' offerings were refused by Aphrodite and he tried to cheat her by refusing her the *exta* (455).[1] Adelphasium's offering is accepted because Hanno is pious: as soon as he arrives he prays to the gods to help him to find his daughters (950); he prays again when he knows from Gyddenis that he is going to find his daughters (1187) and thanks the gods when he has found them (1274 cf. 1251). Such a moral is not impossible for the poet who ended the prologue speech of the *Perikeiromene* with the words: 'for through god even evil may turn out in its course to be good'. Hanno's faith in the justice of the gods is again a real value.

A final instance in which a positive value is asserted can be seen at the end of the *Apistos*. Euclio gives the gold to Lyconides as the girl's dowry.[2] His generosity has no analogy with the sudden liberality of Demea in the *Adelphi*, who is only prodigal of Micio's goods, nor with the final acquiescence of Smikrines in the *Epitrepontes*, because Euclio returns to a former serenity. The finding of the gold converted him from a thrifty peasant to a suspicious miser; what can shake him back? It is true that both Charisios in the *Epitrepontes* and Polemon in the *Perikeiromene* are thrown off their balance by a discovery and are finally reconciled by the generosity of the other party, but in both cases they have themselves repented their hasty decisions long before the reconciliation, while Euclio shows no sign of change in his scene with Lyconides (731). In the *Georgos*, Kleainetos, leading the hard life of a peasant perhaps as a

[1] Cf. Karsten, *Mnemosyne*, XXIX, 363 f.

[2] As Lyconides had promised (774 f.) to inform Euclio if he found the thief, it is most improbable that Lyconides refused to surrender the gold until Euclio had named a dowry or that the allocation of the gold was submitted to the arbitration of Megadorus, as Legrand suggested (*Daos*, 376).

self-imposed penance, is charmed into liberality by the unselfish and generous attention of his young labourer Gorgias. So in this play the final and decisive stroke must have been the return of the gold. Lyconides' slave had found the gold and Euclio probably had no legal proof of ownership (hence his readiness to go shares); Lyconides nevertheless gave it back and destroyed at one stroke the whole mass of suspicion which had accumulated in Euclio's mind; here was a man who was not out for money, but quite simply loved Euclio's daughter.[1]

The philosophy, if one may so call it, behind these plays is not pessimistic. There is much wrong in the world, most obviously the wrong value put on money, and this is dangerous not only to the person himself but to others who follow his example: 'Why do you teach us evil, why do you prove to us that injustice is profitable?' (*Kolax* 54 f.). If it is right to attribute fr. 534K to the beginning of the *Kolax*, the moral is pointed there: 'We, in addition to the necessary evils (of the human body) add others of our own invention, . . . athletic contests, titles, ambitions, conventions.' The wrong values are unnecessary additions to human life, which is not on the whole bad: 'My abuse of fortune was unjust. I cursed her for being blind, and now her sight it seems has saved me. My own labours achieved nothing. For I should not have succeeded without her help. No one therefore must despair when he is in difficulties. For this may be a prophecy of success' (*Koneiazomenai* 13). It is useless to try and deflect the will of the gods if your values are wrong, like the *leno* in the *Karchedonios*, or to try and control them by ritual (*Hiereia*, fr. 245K), but if your values are right, it is possible to live in the simple belief that the gods are just and this belief may be rewarded, as it is for the old Carthaginian explicitly, and implicitly for all the characters in Menander who have the right values.

How is this right sense of values achieved? By education perhaps, but not by repressive legislation. The three references to Demetrius of Phalerum's legislation (in the *Apistos*, the

[1] Jachmann's treatment of this is basically sound: *Plautinisches*, 138.

Kekryphalos, and *Dis Exapaton*)[1] do not imply approval. The speakers themselves, Euclio in the *Apistos* and Chrysalus in the *Dis Exapaton*, are suspect. Lydus' praise of the Old Education in the *Dis Exapaton*[2] is entirely academic because it has had no effect on Pistoclerus, and Megadorus' intention of promoting *homonoia* by marrying a poor wife, however much in accordance with Peripatetic theory,[3] is entirely irrelevant to the actual situation of Phaedria. Menander seems to be saying that Demetrius' prescriptions are external conventions just as much as the wrong value set on wealth or pleasure is an external convention; what is needed is a right valuation of the real facts and a nice discrimination in dealing with them.

V. The Original of the *Aulularia*.

The attribution of the original of the *Aulularia*[4] to Menander rests on much more than Choricus' quotation of l. 301 (Kock, III, p. 37) and the parallel between ll. 91-97 and frs. 136, 476K. The strongest argument is, perhaps, the sustained likeness with the *Samia* and the close affinity with the *Dyskolos*.[5]

[1] (*a*) *Aul.* 504: Euclio underlines the reference to Demetrius' sumptuary legislation in Megadorus' speech (475 f.); (*b*) 292K 'some new-fangled law'; (*c*) *Bacch.* 912.

[2] *Bacch.* 420 f., ultimately reminiscent of the *Clouds*.

[3] *Aul.* 475-493; 496-504; 532-536 certainly reproduce the original; the rest may be Plautus (but see the ingenious defence by J. J. Tierney, *P.R.I.A.*, L., (C), 37 f.). Aristotle quotes Phaleas of Chalkedon as suggesting the regulation of dowries, so that the rich should give and not receive, the poor receive and not give, as the quickest method of securing equality of property (*Politics*, 1266 b 2); it is also a method of securing a large middle class, which Aristotle advocates.

[4] Papyrus fragments Hibeh 5, Flind. Petr. 4, Grenfell II 8 (*b*), Rylands 16 (*a*), Heidelberg 180 have been connected with the original of the *Aulularia* largely because of the rare name Strobilos occurring in Hibeh 5 and Heidelberg 180. The fragments appear to come from the same play: Grenfell II 8 (*b*) contains the word *nomarchos* which suggests an Egyptian origin (Leo, *Hermes*, xli, 632) and Heidelberg 180 with its intrigue between two male slaves has no place in the *Aulularia*. It does not therefore seem necessary to discuss Blass' attribution of Hibeh 5 to Philemon (*Rh. Mus.*, lxii, 102) or Kuiper's interpretation (*Mnem.*, Suppl. II, 1940, 115). Kuiper equates *Aul.* 390 with Diphilus 41K, but the likeness is too weak to build on.

[5] Other parallels are as follows: *Aul.* 3, arrival of deity, with *Dyskolos* 127K; 45 ff., old man's abuse of female slave, with *Epitrepontes* 704 ff.; 74 (cf. 275), female slave's distress at her mistress' condition, with *Georgos* 84 f. (cf. 22 f.):

Several of Menander's plays have been suggested as the original. The case against identification with the *Dyskolos* (particularly 128K) and *Thesauros* is well summed up by Kuiper. The *Hydria* has a rather better claim: but 467K seems to point to a recognition play, and it is not clear how 469K, 470K could belong to the *Aulularia*. Rather than assume an unknown *Philargyros* (derived from the Choricius quotation) I prefer to regard the *Apistos* as the original. The *apistos* is the 'Suspicious man' and Theophrastus' *Apistos* 'when anyone comes to ask for crockery, prefers not to give it' (XVIII, 7), because *apistia* is 'an assumption that everyone is bent on wronging you'. The one fragment (64K) 'I thought if the old man got the money, he would immediately buy a girl and instal her as a lady's maid' could perhaps belong to the prologue and refer either to 'Euclio' or to 'Euclio's grandfather'. The evidence for Euclio being an *apistos* has already been given above, and the 'First Argument' describes Euclio not only as *avarus* but also as *vix sibi credens*.

Menander's chief object is the portrayal of Euclio, just as in the *Samia* his chief object is the portrayal of Demeas. As in that play, the young man's problem matters less. Moschion probably appeared in all the acts of the *Samia* except the third; Lyconides, however, only appears in the fourth and fifth acts of the *Aulularia*. As most commentators have seen, his entrance with Eunomia (682) cannot be his first appearance. He himself says there (696): 'I wonder where my slave Strobilus is whom I had ordered to wait for me here'. Later, when he sees Strobilus, he says: 'I think he must have visited the girl's nurse (Staphyla), as I told him' (815). Both passages refer back to Strobilus' opening speech (587), two lines of which (603-604) have been inserted by Plautus to remind the audience of Lyconides' position because Lyconides is going to appear. It is only reasonable to conclude from the traces that in the

226, incompatibility of rich and poor, with *Cistellaria* 493; 239, character the best dowry, with *Adelphi* 345; 294, inquisitive cook, with *Epitrepontes* fr. 600K; 398, instructions to the kitchen, with *Adelphi* 376; 540, father asked to be cheerful at the wedding, with *Adelphi* 755; 587, the slave's duty with *Epitrepontes* 36 = fr. 581K, *Andria* 675 f.; 605, the slave scout with *Perikeiromene* 58, 105, 164; 682 f., son persuades mother to intercede for him, with *Hiereia* and *Kith.* 1; 715, request to audience, with *Cist.* 678 ff.

original Lyconides has already been told about Megadorus' marriage (603-604) and Staphyla about Lyconides' guilt (807), which she did not know when the play began (30) nor apparently in Act II (275). Kuiper [1] heroically suggests that in the original, Lyconides, not Eunomia, was informed by Megadorus of his proposed marriage. It is, however, simpler to suppose that Lyconides heard the news from Megadorus in the market-place (like Pamphilus in the *Andria*) and returned when Strobilus had just installed the cook with Staphyla (363). Lyconides and Strobilus then decided that Strobilus should tell Staphyla the true position and that Lyconides should consult Eunomia; Lyconides went into the house and Strobilus then told Staphyla; [2] they both withdrew to their respective houses when they saw Euclio coming. After making his report to his master, Strobilus was sent 'scouting' (605). Plautus substituted the Pythodicus scene [3] because he was not interested in Lyconides but wanted to elaborate the cook scenes and the following Megadorus scene (475 ff.). If Lyconides heard the news in the market-place, he presumably went to the market-place in the first act and the play started with an opening scene between Lyconides and Strobilus, in which Lyconides discussed his difficulties with his slave. Such a scene is necessary to bring the divine prologue into the normal place and to introduce Strobilus to the audience, so that they understand Megadorus: *heus, Strobile, sequere propere me ad macellum strenue* (264). Plautus suppressed the first scene and substituted *de summo adulescens loco* (28) for some phrase such as 'whom you have just seen' (cf. *Perik.* 8).[4]

This view is based on the assumption that Plautus has not

[1] *Op. cit.* 59. He also suggests (62 f.) a scene between Staphyla and Lyconides after 274 (Staphyla according to him knows Lyconides' guilt) and between Strobilus and Staphyla at 362. Krieger, *De Aul. ex. Graeco*, 64 f. put a Lyconides/Strobilus scene at the beginning of Act. IV.

[2] In the *Heros*, where also Pheidias knows but Plangon probably does not know, the liaison is probably done by the slaves of the two houses, Daos and Getas.

[3] I think 363-370 are purely Plautine. For various conjectures on Pythodicus see Krieger, *op. cit.*, 37; Kuiper 63; Thierfelder, *Interpolationum*, 128.

[4] Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht*, 136 also suggests an earlier scene with Lyconides. The end of the prologue is modelled on Euripides, *Hecuba* 52, and is therefore likely to belong to the original.

altered the essential relations between Megadorus, Lyconides, Eunomia and Strobilus. Lyconides is the nephew (and perhaps the adopted son) of Megadorus, lives in his house,[1] and uses his slave Strobilus. That Eunomia lives in the same house is not certain.[2] If she lives in the same house, the action is simpler. Strobilus goes in with his report from Staphyla (before 371); Lyconides then finally decides to ask for Eunomia's help (as he had already explained to the audience) and while he goes to see Eunomia, sends Strobilus out to scout (586). Strobilus has the same relation to young and old master as Parmenon in the *Samia*, Daos in the *Perikeiromene*, etc., and his relation to the young master, which in Plautus does not appear until the fourth act (587 f.), was clear from the first scene of Menander's play. He is named by Megadorus (264), the cook (334), Staphyla (354), and Lyconides (697, 804, 812). He describes Euclio's character to the cook (296 f.) but hesitates about the identity of Euclio when he sees him (619): 'this, as I think, is the father of the girl whom my master loves'. His hesitation is justified, as will appear, and this line should not be used as evidence for inventing a 'slave of Lyconides' other than Strobilus.[3]

Menander's play began with a scene between Lyconides and Strobilus. The divine prologue followed. The speaker in Plautus is the Lar familiaris. The suggestion for the original that has found most favour is Heros,[4] but the references quoted suggest that the Greek Heros stood outside the house and the Lar, like Pan in the *Dyskolos* (127K = *Aul.* 3), comes from inside, and the emphasis on the hearth (7, 387) suggests that Menander's figure was Hestia. The following scenes with Staphyla serve to characterise Euclio, as also Euclio's final

[1] The decisive line is 727 *ante aedis nostras*, certainly from the original as parallelled by *Fab. Inc.* 30 (this parallel disposes of Thierfelder's suggestion, *Interpolationum*, 149 n. 1, that *ante aedis nostras* is erroneous amplification by Plautus).

[2] The case on either side is put by Krieger, *op. cit.*, 20 f.; Kuiper, 47 f. Note that Eunomia does not arrive at l. 120 but apparently comes out of the house (133). *Advento monitum* (145) is perhaps metaphorical.

[3] The superscription of IV. 1 is *Servus* in B, of IV. 2 *Euclio senex, Strobilus servus*. On l. 619, see Krieger, *op. cit.*, 75; Kuiper, 42, 69.

[4] Leo, *Pl. F.*,[2] 211 n. 2; Krieger, *op. cit.*, 9; Kuiper, 37; Skutsch, *CR*, 1936, 213.

monologue (103 f.).[1] Kuiper[2] is possibly right in assigning the scene between Megadorus and Eunomia (or as he thinks Lyconides) to the first act: it belongs to the preparation rather than to the action proper; the act would then end with both returning into the house at the sight of the chorus approaching. The second act then starts with Megadorus' proposal of marriage and ends with Euclio's departure to the market (279); the duplication of Euclio's excursion into the house (203, 243) is paralleled in the three similar comedy scenes of the *Perikeiromene* (108, 120) and *Samia* (203, 217; 318, 336).[3]

Menander's third act starts with the return of Strobilus (280); his departure to the market and his return must be separated by an act-ending. The gap between the housing of the cooks (362) and the return of Euclio (371) was probably filled, as has been said, with the scene between Lyconides and Strobilus and the scene between Strobilus and Staphyla both of whom disappear at the approach of Euclio. Anthrax' words at the door (398 f.) are good Menander (cf. *Adelphi* 375) and cover the few moments before Congrio bursts out of the house (405). Kuiper (87, n. 1) well says: 'the cook and his helpers, meant as a kind surprise, are considered by Euclio as a scouting patrol'. The act cannot end here and Megadorus, as well as his slave and Euclio, should return from the market before it closes. Leaving on one side the question of Plautine expansion in the rest of the act (406-585), we must ask whether he has altered its structure. The bare bones of the action are as follows: Congrio and his troop burst out of the house (406); Euclio pursues and stops them (415); Euclio goes back into the house (444), Congrio waits because his gear is inside (446); Euclio returns with his pot of gold (449 f.) and drives Congrio and his troop into the house (?). Euclio cannot then get away with his pot because Megadorus arrives (473). He refuses Megadorus'

[1] Kuiper, 7, well defends this passage as Greek against Krieger, *op. cit.*, 16 f. (cf. Tenney Frank, *A. J. Ph.*, 1937, 345). Wilamowitz, *Schiedsgericht*, 136 notes distributions under Lycurgus. A dramatic parallel for the fruitless errand of a fussy man is *Heautontimoroumenos* 170-171 (cf. also Ar. *Eccl.* 351-380).

[2] 33 f.

[3] Krieger's objections to 240-255 therefore are not justified (*op. cit.*, 22 n. 2).

offer of wine (569); finally Megadorus goes in to sacrifice and Euclio goes with his pot to the Shrine of *Fides*. Kuiper (86 f.) thinks that 415-448, 451-459 are all additions of Plautus; Congrio vanishes for ever when he leaves the house and his elaborate exit gives Euclio time to dig up the pot, which according to Kuiper he cannot do in the space of the four and a half lines (444-448).[1] Krieger (46 f.) also thinks that the cooks vanish for ever but not until they have done battle with Euclio; he refuses to believe that Euclio meets Megadorus carrying his pot; he therefore regards 441-458 as Plautine additions and sends Euclio in to drink with Megadorus at the end (571).[2] Plautus himself has not made the destination of the cooks entirely clear (455 *intro abi*; 459 *aut abi . . . ab aedibus*; 460 *illic hinc abiit*); it is true, as Kuiper nicely remarks, that Euclio regards the cooks as 'a scouting patrol' and therefore after their departure might remove his pot in preparation for the main attack by Megadorus, but his behaviour, when he leaves Congrio by the door, fetches his pot, then drives Congrio inside is so like his treatment of Staphyla (40-89) that it should be in essence genuine Menander; the cook's reason for staying—that his gear is inside (cf. *Samia* 149 f.)—also seems genuine. Euclio's reason for stopping the cooks' flight (415) is that he wants to make certain that they are not carrying the pot away (cf. 631 f.); of this dialogue at least 415, 423-444 may be Menander. Krieger misses the excellent comedy of Megadorus catching Euclio with his pot.

The main lines of the action seem therefore to be true to Menander; but where does Euclio hide his pot? He takes it into a shrine of Pistis (*Fides*) on the stage and spends the interval between the third and fourth acts hiding it there. At the beginning of the fourth act (587) Strobilus comes out of Megadorus' house to scout; he takes up a position in front of the shrine

[1] Kuiper (40) further argues on the basis of the scratching cock (467) that Euclio kept his gold in the garden. But surely a cock may scratch in a Greek kitchen and only in the kitchen could the cock be bribed by the cooks (470), which is certainly Menander because of the echo of *Wasps* 100. His other evidence for the garden (fr. III, 242-244) is also irrelevant.

[2] For the acceptance of the invitation, Krieger quotes Micio and Demea (*Adelphi*, 754 f., 794 f.) but the true parallels are the refusals in *Heautontimoroumenos* (162) and *Dyskolos* (see Section IX).

from which he can see both houses (606).[1] Euclio inside the shrine begs Pistis to keep his gold safe and then crosses over to his own house. Strobilus thinks that he recognises his back as he goes across (619) and himself goes into the shrine. Euclio dashes out again, warned by the crow that something is amiss (he is 'superstitious' as well as 'suspicious'), dashes into the shrine and seizes Strobilus; when he has searched him and found nothing, he tries to drive him away while he searches in the shrine for an accomplice; Strobilus crouches up against the wall of the shrine, and sees Euclio come out with his pot and make off for the Grove of Pan (*Silvanus*); he disregards his master's commands (680, cf. 605, 697) and pursues Euclio.[2] As he goes off, Lyconides and Eunomia come out of Megadorus' house.

Euclio's actions may not be entirely sensible, but the sequence of scenes is admirable comedy. The argument that Plautus has invented the first of the two hiding-places (*Fides*) disregards Menander's love of duplication in these comedy scenes (cf. above on Act II, 204 f., 244 f.). Moreover the hopelessness of finding a safe place for the gold may contribute to Euclio's later willingness to part with it. Doubts have been expressed about the existence of a shrine of *Pistis* in Athens.[3] There is, however, a single passage which supports a shrine of *Pistis* in Attica; and if Euclio is the *Apistos*, that the *Apistos* should come to grief with *Pistis* herself was a point too good to miss. There is no reason to follow Kuiper in objecting to the shrine as a third building on the stage. Three houses are necessary in the *Perikeiromene*: it is difficult to see how the *Dyskolos* could have been staged without two houses (the house of the *dyskolos* himself and the house where the injured girl lived) as well as the Nymphaion from which Pan entered to speak the prologue.[4]

[1] Krieger's objection (*op. cit.* 61) that only a suppliant sits *on* an altar is valid; in Menander, Strobilus either sat on the steps of the shrine or *near* the altar.

[2] A slight analogy for Strobilus' desertion of his master may be seen in Parmeno's flight, *Samia* 109. The scene between Euclio and Strobilus (631 f.) is milder than the papyrus fragment of the *Perinthia*, but of the same general kind.

[3] E.g. Krieger, *op. cit.*, 53; Kuiper, 36; Klotz, *Rh. Mus.*, lxxxix. 317.

[4] Cf. also the *Kapeleion* of the *Theophoroumene*.

A clear break separates the departure of Lyconides and the arrival of Strobilus (701) and here the fourth act must end, since the journey to Pan's grove and back should need an interlude between acts to cover it and there is no later break; Euclio enters on the heels of Strobilus (713); Lyconides waits after his scene with Euclio for Strobilus to come out again (804 f.). That Euclio comes out before this scene between Strobilus and Lyconides finishes appears certain from the appearance of his name in the superscription of the scene.[1] The argument and the fragments tell us a little more. According to the first argument, *per dolum mox Euclio cum perdidisset aulam, insperato invenit laetusque natam conlocat Lyconidi :* 'Euclio unexpectedly finds his pot again and joyfully bestows his daughter on Lyconides.' The second argument says that Lyconides reports the theft to Euclio and is presented by him with the gold, the girl and the child. Of the fragments, in IV Euclio says that he will be able to sleep now; he had no rest night or day (while he possessed the gold, cf. 67 f.); fr. II is perhaps spoken by Euclio, overhearing Lyconides dealing with Strobilus; fr. I may refer to the use of some of the gold; fr. V has been referred to the freeing of Strobilus.[2] We cannot hope to reconstruct these last scenes nor are the details important since it is certain that the bride is properly dowered, possibly also trousseaued, which had been Hestia's intention in allowing Euclio to discover the gold originally.

VI. *Dis Exapaton.*

Plautus' *Bacchides* twice quotes Menander's *Dis Exapaton* (308 = 126K, 816 = 125K);[3] of the other two quotations of Menander's play, 123K appears to be a fragment of the *Second Adelphoi*, and 124K is a routine formula which may belong in several places in Plautus' play.[4] But, although an original by

[1] See Ritschl's apparatus.

[2] Cf. Kunst, *Szenische Untersuchungen*, 122.

[3] Reitzenstein, *Hermes*, 1930, 77, suggests that 820 is also direct translation of the Greek. Menander was quoting Sophocles (fr. 945P).

[4] Prehn, *Quaestiones Plautinae*, 66 equates with 1117-1118, but cf. also 579 f. and at least two similar occasions in the lost beginning.

Menander is therefore assured, scholars have widely differing views as to how much Plautus has altered the presuppositions, structure, and colouring of Menander's play.[1] The loss of the beginning of Plautus' play makes the situation obscure, but the main lines seem to be as follows: Mnesilochus fell in love with Bacchis II soon after he arrived in Ephesus (388: cf. Moschion in the *Kitharistes*); when the soldier outbid him and carried her off to Samos (574), he knew that she would try and set up on her own in Athens (though nothing was said about her twin sister) and asked Pistoclerus to look for her (176). Pistoclerus searched, like Lampadio in the *Synaristosai*, and finally found Bacchis I, who had recently come to live next door to Mnesilochus' father (205), just before Bacchis II arrived. Bacchis I saw that, if the bargain between the soldier and Bacchis II was ratified in the presence of an Athenian citizen, Bacchis II had a better chance of getting home at the end of her year. It was perhaps the same sort of advantage that Thais in the *Eunuch* hoped to get from the patronage of Simo (1039). Moreover, at the moment she fears actual violence and seeks a protector, as Thais also sought the protection of Chremes (*Bacch.* 592 with *Eun.* 797).

The fragments give some help in reconstructing the beginning, which may have run as follows: Sc. 1: Pistoclerus, probably accompanied by a protesting Lydus (XV,[2] I, II, XVII), has come to the end of his Odyssey and discovered Bacchis I; after a preliminary attempt to make love to him (XII, XIII, XIV, XVIII, XIX),[3] she tells him that she has a twin sister (V, VI), who is in the possession of a soldier (VIII, IX) but is shortly returning: she is cleaning the house against her arrival (III, IV, cf. *Stichus* 347).[4] Pistoclerus departs. Sc. 2: A divine prologue is not certain in this play, but would be useful to give a factual account of the past history, scene, and characters. Sc. 3:

[1] Kuiper, *Griekſche Origineelen*, 204 f., makes the play into a recognition play in which the two Bacchides are free Samian women of blameless reputation and daughters of Nicobulus.

[2] According to Fraenkel (*Pl. and Pl.* 9) the beginning of a monologue; possibly Lydus opened the scene with these words.

[3] XIV may rather belong to the dialogue between the two Bacchises, i.e. 'are you out for money or marriage?'

[4] Kunst, *Szenische Studien*, 107.

A slave brings Bacchis II and states the soldier's conditions (X, XI, cf. 577). Sc. 4: The sisters discuss the situation and decide to make use of Pistoclerus, who then returns without Lydus. The act ends with the withdrawal of the sisters before the arrival of the chorus (106, cf. *Perikeiromene* 71, *Epitrepontes* 33); the interval gives Pistoclerus time to go to the market and return. His attitude in the preserved portion of the first act, though undoubtedly exaggerated by Plautus,[1] is not unlike that of Chremes in the *Eunuch* (507 f.).

The second act begins with the return of Lydus and Pistoclerus from the market (109). The stage is empty for a moment when Chrysalus enters and greets his native land (170, cf. *Stichus* 649). After learning the situation from Pistoclerus, he carries out his 'first deceit' of Nicobulus. According to Plautus, Nicobulus goes to the forum to look for his son (348), followed at the end of the scene by Chrysalus (366); but later Chrysalus waits for him to come out of his front door (768). There seems no reason to suppose that Plautus has suppressed the return of Nicobulus and therefore probably, in Menander, Nicobulus went into his house.[2] Lydus enters as Chrysalus leaves; the original monologue of Chaerea at the end of the third act of the *Eunuch* (549) is a formal parallel and Lydus' departure must be separated from his return by an act break. Similarly, Mnesilochus cannot return from the forum until after an act break (366, 391); the second act must, therefore, end at l. 384.

The third act opens with Mnesilochus' soliloquy (385) followed by his overhearing of Philoxenus and Lydus (405). The play is given a new movement by a disastrous but perfectly natural misunderstanding like that of Geta in the *Adelphi* (299) and Demeas in the *Samia* (1 f.).[3] When does the third act end? If the visit of the parasite (573) comes from the original (and dramatically we should be again reminded of the soldier's immin-

[1] See Thierfelder, *Interpolationum*, 105 f.; Leo, *Pl. F.*,[1] 139 justifies 70 f. as Menander.

[2] Plautus has probably considerably extended the soliloquy of Chrysalus (cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 23 on 361), as also the succeeding soliloquy of Lydus (*ibid.* 152-153).

[3] Kunst, *op. cit.*, 107 adds *Andr.* 420; he notes also the likeness of content between 477 f. and *Heauton.* 562 ff.

ence), it should be included in the third act since in the fourth act Cleomachus arrives as a result of the parasite's return (842). This division is possible if Mnesilochus only has to go into his father's house to pay back the money (525, cf. above). As the parasite scene has been suspected,[1] it is worth noting the likeness of the parasite's entrance to the entrance of Sosias in the *Perikeiromene* (52 f.) and of Pistoclerus' courage to Chremes' behaviour in the *Eunuch* (797). Menander, therefore, probably ended the third act with Pistoclerus' short soliloquy (609); 610-611 are Plautine cement.

The long fourth act contains the devising and execution of the 'Second Deceit'; no break seems possible between devising and execution (760). The scene sequence is similar in the *Andria-Perinthia*:[2] two friends in great distress are joined by a slave in high good humour, who devises a plan which he scarcely deigns to explain. The plan includes a tableau, which has an unexpected success because of the supervention of a further character. The slave is later punished. In the crucial tableau scene here, Chrysalus produces his result, like Chaireas in the *Koneiazomenai*, by playing off his unsuspecting partners against one another. Thus, this sequence consists of scenes and situations which can be paralleled elsewhere in Menander, and the Plautine elements which have been noted[3] are an overlay on the original structure.

So far all is clear: but many scholars have rejected the 'Third Deceit' (979 f.) as Plautine. It should, however, be remembered that Menander likes duplications; in the *Aulularia* Euclio entrusts his pot to *Fides* before committing it to Silvanus.

In the *Heautontimoroumenos* (733 ff.) Syrus first transfers Bacchis and all her train to Menedemus' house, and then proceeds to extract money from Chremes on the flimsy pretext that his new-found daughter owes it to Bacchis (790 f.); the sequence of spectacle followed by intrigue, which both depend from a single half-revealed plan (*Heautont.* 696 f.), has the same

[1] E.g. by Kuiper, *op. cit.*, 229. I am however inclined to accept his argument that *Elatia* (591) is an allusion to Roman and *not* to Greek history.

[2] Cf. *Bacch.* 500, 692, 733, 844 with *Andr.* 625, 670, 705, 732.

[3] See particularly Fraenkel's (*op. cit.*, 353) analysis of Chrysalus' *canticum* 640 f.

structural lines as the fourth act of the *Dis Exapaton* when freed of its Plautine accretions, notably 640 f., 709 f., 925-978, 987 f., 1053 f., 1069 f.[1] The great *canticum* destroys the structure of the scene; in Menander, Nicobulus' soliloquy (913-924; 979) covered Chrysalus' visit to Mnesilochus to get the second letter,[2] and *ad lacrimas hominem coegi castigando* (981) picks up Chrysalus' parting remark *plura ex me audiet hodie mala quam audivit umquam Clinia ex Demetrio* (911); this is in itself a piece of effrontery which Menander used again in the *Adelphi* (558 f.). The 'Second and Third Deceits' (and note that Galen speaks of slaves in Menander who think they must *thrice* deceive their masters, 946K) are in fact a single deceit in two parts and the double plan is made at the beginning (705-708); moreover, Chrysalus' final acceptance of the gold (1059) is carefully prepared in the punishment scene (824), and this gold is finally used to break Nicobulus in the last act (1184 f.). The unity of the act has been masked by the insertion of two great *cantica* (640, 925), the first largely and the second entirely the work of Plautus.

The fifth act begins with the return of Philoxenus (1076), who then listens to Nicobulus' self-reproach, like Demeas in the *Samia* (231) and Menedemus in the *Heautontimoroumenos* (915). Fraenkel[3] has described how Plautus has converted the whole last act into a series of musical scenes and in particular, the elaboration of the metaphor of the sheep (1120-1148), which may itself be an image used by Menander (cf. *Ad.* 534). Although the identification of 1117-1118 with fr. 124K is uncertain, other elements in this last scene seem genuine, but Bacchis II was presumably a mute figure. The elderly lover is well known to us and the capitulation of Nicobulus to a mixture of greed and lust is true to his character all through; Philoxenus had no great strength anyway. The conscious balancing of the capture of Pistoclerus at the beginning by the capture of Nicobulus at the end has parallels in Menander; Fraenkel has noted the likeness of the end to the *Adelphi* and there, too, the reversal of

[1] See Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 61 ff., 237 ff.
[2] On all this see Theiler, *Hermes*, 1938, 269 f.
[3] *Op. cit.*, 72 f.

the relations between Micio and Demea balances the picture of them in the first act; similarly the shearing of Glykera at the beginning of the *Perikeiromene* is balanced by the reconciliation at the end.[1]

VII. *Karchedonios.*

Plautus' *Poenulus* may be an adaptation of Menander's *Karchedonios*. The only two plays known to have had this title are by Alexis and Menander; Plautus is more likely to have looked to Menander for an original. The preserved fragments of neither play give a certain answer. Five of the Menander fragments are too general in character to give any help (261, 262, 264, 265, 267K), but are certainly not incompatible with the *Poenulus*. 'Need teaches the Carthaginian wisdom, even if he is unlearned' (263K) agrees with *Poenulus* 111 'So with skill and cunning he seeks his daughters', and *marsuppio* (782) may be a translation of ἀσκοπυτίνη (266K). On the other hand, it is difficult to see how a sacrifice to Boreas (260K) can be fitted into the *Poenulus*, but Athenaeus may have misquoted. The Alexis fragment (100K) has been regarded as a translation of *Poen.* 1318 but is too slight as a basis of attribution.[2]

The case for Menander must rest on a comparison with his other plays. The general shape of the *Poenulus*, deception followed by recognition, is known from the *Epitrepontes*, *Andria*, and other plays of Menander. Two plays have rather closer connexions: the *Kolax*, in which a *leno* is discomfited, and the *Misoumenos*, in which a father discovers his daughter in a foreign town. In the *Kolax*, as in the *Poenulus*, the action takes place on the day of a festival of Aphrodite (292K);[3] a young man is in love with a girl who is the slave of a *leno*; the *leno* is afraid of a lawsuit, and therefore presumably knows that the girl is a citizen; in the *Poenulus* this knowledge makes the *leno* particularly unwilling to let her fellow-citizen Agorastocles have the girl,[4] and in the *Kolax*, someone must have arrived, like Hanno,

[1] Cf. the balance of Acts II and IV in the *Andria*.

[2] See Kunst, *Szenische Studien*, 123; Zuntz, *Mnemosyne*, 1937, 61; Lucas, *Rh. Mus.*, 1939, 189.

[3] See also Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*,[1] 159.

[4] Mesk, *Wiener Studien*, liv. 51 f.

to prove the girl's birth. Bias (in the *Kolax*) and Antamoenides are a pair of similar braggart soldiers, but Bias, unlike Antamoenides, is in love with the same girl as Pheidias. The main lines must have been similar, but the first victim of the intrigue in the *Kolax* was the soldier and not the *leno*. In the *Misoumenos*, as in the *Poenulus*, a father travels abroad in search of his daughter, but before the recognition scene he has already been in communication, probably through his slave and Getas, with his daughter or her nurse. The recognition scene has two points of contact with the *Poenulus* : the nurse's opening words are much alike in both (*Mis.* 12, *Poen.* 1122-1127, cf. also *Andr.* 801, *Heaut.* 405) and the irruption of Antamoenides is so like the speech of Getas (*Poen.* 1296 f. ; *Mis.* 18 f.) [1] that Plautus seems to have been adapting a very similar original.

The young master and slave in the *Poenulus* bear a general likeness to Moschion and Daos in the *Perikeiromene* and to the pair in the *Synaristosai* (= *Cistellaria*) ; of more moment perhaps than the general likeness is the slave's firm dealing with an anxious young master (427 f.), which recurs in the *Andria* (708 f.).[2] The two sisters may be compared with the pair of wives in the *First Adelphoi* (= *Stichus*) ; like the two wives the two girls here are differentiated ; [3] Adelphasium is more independent and high-minded than Anterastilis ; she has listened more attentively to Gyddenis than to the *leno*, and so has preserved her standards like Selenium in the care of Melaenis (*Synaristosai*). There are also some minor points of contact with other Menander plays.[4]

[1] The parallel was originally noted by Körte and is well elaborated by Theiler, *Hermes*, lxxiii. 294.

[2] The allusion to Oedipus (443) is repeated *Andria* 194 (cf. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 13).

[3] Cf. Thierfelder, *Interpolationum*, 68 n. 2.

[4] Compare 335 ff. with *Cist.* 449 ff. ; 350 with Turpilius' *Leucadia*, 107, fr. VI R—dialogue of Agorastocles and Adelphasium ; 765, mistaken ingenuity of *leno*, with *Andria* 470 (Theiler, *op. cit.*, 290 notes use of *adlegare* 773, 1100 with *Andria* 899 ; *adsimulare* 560, 600, 1106 with *Andria* 168, etc.) ; 1326 = 1412, soldier's congratulations to Hanno with *Perik.* 432 ; 515 f., *advocati*, contrast between rich and poor, with *Kybernetai* 301K ; 820, *advocati* afraid that they will not be paid, 303K ; the idea of partisan witnesses with *Koneiazomenai* (*fab. inc.* 6 f.).

The cumulative evidence of these parallels seems to justify further examination of the *Poenulus* in the hope of being able to see something of the outline of a Menander play lying beneath the Plautine adaptation. How drastically Plautus handled his original here is suggested by the various theories which have been put forward in recent years.[1] The bolder assumptions of contamination on the scale suggested by Leo and Jachmann or of complete remodelling as imagined by Barbara Krysiniel need not be accepted, if there is a reasonable probability that Menander's *Karchedonios* followed the general lines of the *Kolax* and Agorastocles first tried an intrigue against the *leno* before the solution was provided by the arrival of Hanno. It remains necessary, however, to discuss the difficulties, particularly Milphio's monologue (817 f.) and the *exta* motif (both claimed as 'bridges' by those who believe in 'contamination'), the early production of Milphio's plan (159 f.) and the supposed inconsistency between the characters as drawn in the earlier and later part of the play.

Plautus' play starts with a prologue, the latter part of which (59 f.) seems to be fairly close to Menander except for certain obvious jokes (62, 71, 79 f., 116 f., 125 f.). There is no sound reason for rejecting the lines (96 f.) which recur later in the play;[2] a similar repetition occurs in the *Perikeiromene* (45 f. and 443), the only instance that we can check. Jachmann[3] regards the account of Hanno's methods (106-113) as Plautine because they are an example of *Punica fides*, but I see no reason to suppose that *Poenus plane est* refers to more than the last line (112) and I suspect that the Roman poet has added Hanno's knowledge of languages because he wants to introduce the Carthaginian soliloquy later (930); there Menander's Hanno probably recalled his weary search because he thinks that he must start it

[1] E.g. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*,[1] 153, contamination of *Karchedonios* with Collybiscus comedy; Karsten, *Mnemosyne*, XXIX, 363, contamination shown by different characterisation in Acts I and V; Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 262, only the hetaira scene (210-409) introduced from another play; Jachmann, *Plautinisches und Attisches*, 195, contamination redefended; Krysiniel, *Eos*, XXXIV, 1 (Klotz accepts her main contention, *Ph. W.*, 1934, 289), Hanno himself plays the part of Collybiscus.

[2] Krysiniel, *op. cit.*, 4 f.; Klotz, *op. cit.*, 290. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 318, n. 2 defends 102 f. against Jachmann.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 200.

again ; in fact, however, his host can save him the search. Who spoke the prologue we cannot say ; it comes first because Plautus wanted to write the long and purely Roman introduction. There is nothing to show whether either Agorastocles or Lycus have already been seen. A play is, however, very unlikely to start with a soliloquy by a *leno*, and the reference to *hic adulescens* (96) may imply a previous appearance of Agorastocles ; an opening dialogue of Agorastocles and Milphio is a likely beginning and parts of it may have been used by Plautus in 129 f. The *leno* must, however, have appeared in the first act because, if he belongs to a house on the stage, he must go out from it before he can return. He returns from the temple of Aphrodite in the second act (449, cf. 264) ; therefore he must have gone there in the first act. It seems likely that in Menander the *leno* with Syncerastus carrying the *vasa* set out for the temple after the formal prologue. The *leno* would give instructions to Gyddenis (86) to prepare the girls for the temple, in which case Adelphasium's opening speech (217) refers back to this. The suggestion [1] that Gyddenis herself goes to the temple with the girls (333) and returns with the *vasa* (821) seems to me impossible for the simple reason that, if she goes as the girls' attendant, she cannot return until they return. It is probable also that Agorastocles met the *leno* setting out for the temple and was again refused (cf. 752) ; Agorastocles would thus be informed of the need for immediate action : the girls were to start their career as *hetairae* after the Aphrodite festival.

This situation makes Agorastocles demand help from Milphio who then formulates the Collybiscus intrigue. As Leo said, this cannot belong to the first act, because it is not exposition but action ; it is in fact the beginning of the Second Act.[2] At the end of this scene, Agorastocles says : ' I am going to the temple ' (190). Milphio answers : ' Let us go inside to teach Collybiscus his part first.' Agorastocles agrees ; Milphio remains outside and then calls Agorastocles out to see the girls, who are preparing to go to the temple ; after the girls have departed, Agorastocles

[1] Krysiniel and Theiler, *loc. cit.*

[2] Leo, *op. cit.*, 160 f. For this reason I cannot accept the suggestions that the *leno* first came out at 155 (Karsten, *op. cit.*, 377) or at 201 (Kloìz, *op. cit.*, 292).

informs Milphio that he had handed over the money to Collybiscus before Milphio called him outside (415). The whole passage (189-415) has been subjected to all kinds of criticism. The starting point must be the necessities of the action: Agorastocles must go off to the agora in the Second Act (447) in order that he may bring the witnesses back in the third act (504); he must therefore give the money to Collybiscus before he goes. It follows that there must be an interlude between the formation of the plan and when he comes out again to go to the agora; the main lines of the lay-out must be Agorastocles/Milphio: (Agorastocles indoors): Agorastocles/Milphio; Agorastocles off. Secondly too much stress must not be laid on Milphio's *abeamus intro* (194) and his failure to go in at once; in the *Epitrepontes* Syriskos tells his wife to go in (201), then changes his mind and counts the trinkets (205); later, when he has told her again to go in (229), he agrees that Onesimos shall keep the ring until the next day (239), but an hour or two later demands it back (266); if this had been a Roman adaptation it would surely have been criticised.[1] Milphio's soliloquy may have been altered by Plautus, but the first line at least sounds good Menander (198). Thirdly, the girls must go to the temple in order that they may later return from it, and the contrast between their successful sacrifice to Aphrodite and the *leno*'s failure to appease should belong to the original. It is difficult to see where the scene of their departure could be introduced except here or why Plautus should have moved its position. It is more natural to suppose that he has kept Menander's order and that Menander used the scene to divide the two necessary and necessarily separate Agorastocles/Milphio scenes and thus made the second scene (410 f.) come alive because Agorastocles is given a fresh reason for appealing to Milphio.

In Menander the girls went to the temple and Agorastocles saw them; but the present arrangement of the scene with four speaking parts must be due to Plautus. It seems to be more likely that Plautus elaborated a scene of the original than that he transferred a scene from another play, since the very passages

[1] In the *Koneiazomenai* (12) the young man soliloquises for at least 7 lines after saying that he will go in.

which have made this scene suspect are the most obviously Roman in quality:[1] 221 f.; 248 f.; 265 f.; 277 f.; 292 f.; 308 f.; 320 f.; 351-400 (except 359-364). Although this is the only play in which we see two free girls brought up by their nurse and a *leno*, it is not unexpected that one should have listened to Gyddenis and the other to the *leno;* this contrast has been preserved in places, e.g. 238 (cf. 1201), 250 f., 263-264, 300 f., and accounts for Adelphasium's attitude to Agorastocles (335, 350, 359 ff.). Some of Agorastocles' comments also belong to the original (255-256, 275-276 = *Andria* 759), and two of Milphio's sound like Menander (281, 313);[2] they may have been transferred from the dialogue succeeding this scene. The easiest assumption is that in Menander Milphio went in to summon Agorastocles, who came out during the dialogue of the sisters and commented unseen (255 f., 275 f.); he only addressed them when they were ready to go; when they had gone, he called on Milphio. When Agorastocles finally goes off to the agora to find witnesses, the *leno* arrives back from the temple.

The third act begins with the arrival of Agorastocles and the *advocati*. As explained above, the bones of this seem to be Menander. As we cannot assume at this time that the leader of the *advocati* was the leader of the chorus, Plautus must have altered the second scene; presumably in the original Agorastocles summoned Milphio out and then himself went in before Collybiscus appeared: Collybiscus' entreaty (604) was in the original addressed to Milphio. Similarly in the original Agorastocles was not recalled until Collybiscus and the *leno* had gone into the *leno's* house (720).[3] The hasty departure of Lycus (795) makes it possible for Collybiscus to reappear; he could not be left in the *leno*'s house. The act ends with the withdrawal of the *advocati*.

Legrand[4] sought a solution of the difficulties at the beginning of the fourth act by transferring 817-929 (omitting 917-922) to

[1] Cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 179 on 210 f.; 39 on 248; 141 on 265; 217 on 277, 292.

[2] See Theiler, *op. cit.*, 292 on 281 (cf. 98, 292, 1096): compare 313 with *Heros*, 15 f. cf. J. J. Tierney, *P.R.I.A.*, L (C), 56.

[3] Cf. Jachmann, *op. cit.*, 203 f.

[4] *R.E.G.*, xvii, 359.

the beginning of the third act. The writer of 929 evidently intended this because Agorastocles' only visit to the forum is in the second act (448); he was no doubt troubled by Milphio's ignorance of what has happened and his statement that another weapon is threatening the *leno* before the first has been thrown (919); probably he also inserted the reference to Collybiscus eating the *exta* (804), but forgot a later reference to their non-arrival (617), where Lycus appears to expect them to be brought back at the same time as the girls. But the transference involves a greater difficulty: either Milphio waits until after Hanno's arrival to tell his master that according to Syncerastus the girls are Carthaginian or Agorastocles shows no reaction to the news; Agorastocles' words (961) should refer to something that he has recently heard (cf. e.g. Hegio in the *Adelphi* 447) and it is incredible that Milphio should be silent for so long.

If we keep the traditional order, we have the difficulty that Milphio appears not to know that the Collybiscus plan is complete. But is the Collybiscus plan in fact complete? Or are Milphio's phrases (817, 909, 919) compatible with the intermediate stage in which the intrigue has succeeded, but the *leno* has not yet been brought to justice? The only obstacle is *priu' quam unumst iniectum telum* (919), which Fraenkel[1] interprets as Plautine carelessness; in any case, though the weapon may have been thrown, its full effect has not yet been felt. The sound reason for Milphio coming out is not that he is ignorant of Collybiscus' success but that the *leno* has run away (798) and Agorastocles wants to know whether he has returned. Otherwise apart from Plautine elaborations the scene with Syncerastus is sound; his confidences are more convincing if he has witnessed the meeting of Lycus and Agorastocles in the first act.

Hanno enters as Milphio goes in (950): perhaps he tells something of his methods of searching between his opening prayer and his reference to Antidamas. The parallel for the arrival of the recogniser in the fourth act is Crito in the *Andria*. The whole passage between Agorastocles' remark that Hanno is a Carthaginian and his greeting is Plautine invention (978-1035).

[1] *Op. cit.*, 269.

Milphio cannot be on the stage for the Gyddenis scene and therefore presumably is sent inside as soon as the recognition between Hanno and Agorastocles is complete (1078). Agorastocles then suggests that Hanno should pretend to be the father of the girls, a joke which, with a Sophoclean twist, turns out to be true (1086-1170). He must, of course, also tell him that they have a nurse to introduce the Gyddenis scene; this point Plautus has omitted.[1] After the Gyddenis scene which proves Hanno to be the girls' father, Agorastocles asks for Adelphasium's hand. Here, with the two essential recognitions completed, the fourth act ends.

The return of the girls presents the same kind of problems as their earlier scene. If they are both to speak and the character contrast is genuine, as it seems to be (particularly 1184 ff., 1192 ff., 1201 ff.), only Hanno can be present, and an inspection of Agorastocles' lines often suggests Plautus, particularly 1191, 1206, 1209, 1212-1230. Does Hanno in fact threaten his daughters with the law? Parallels for this harmless trickery can be seen in Antiphon's story of his future marriage (*Stichus* 108) and Micio's fictitious visitor from Miletus (*Adelphi* 650). Menander may have introduced it as a light touch suitable for the last act when the main recognition has been clinched: the *testatio* is a Roman addition.[2] Then Hanno greets his daughters with a reference to divine justice clearly of a piece with his earlier and later utterances (1251 = 1187, 1274). For them the proof is the reference to Gyddenis (1265). The irruption of Antamoenides seems to be Menander because of the parallel with the *Misoumenos* (see above); we must assume that Hanno sends Adelphasium in to Agorastocles before Antamoenides comes out (1280). Anterastilis then may be sent into the house as soon as Antamoenides turns on Hanno; Agorastocles comes out. The last scene was played with Agorastocles, Antamoenides and Lycus.

VIII. *First Adelphoi.*

Four preliminary questions have to be answered: Was the *First Adelphoi* the same as the *Philadelphoi*? Does the

[1] Cf. Klotz, *op. cit.*, 294.

[2] Cf. Thierfelder, *op. cit.*, 51 n. 1.

Papyrus Didot a belong to the *First Adelphoi*? Can the fragments of the *First Adelphoi* be identified in the *Stichus*? Does the end of the *Stichus* belong to the *First Adelphoi*?

The old suggestion of Hermann, elaborated by Ritschl, that the original of the *Stichus* was the *Philadelphoi* cannot be proved because there is no exact translation of any of the surviving fragments in the *Stichus*, but no fragment is incompatible with the original of the *Stichus*.[1] It is at least tempting to suppose that the *First Adelphoi* like the *Second* had another title to distinguish it, although the only real gain is the suggestion of another scene between father and daughter (or daughters). This further scene becomes a certainty if we accept Hans Lucas' identification of the Papyrus Didot a as a self-defence by one of the daughters;[2] the strong argument lies in the likeness of Didot 19 to *Stichus* 133 and of Didot 6/7 to *Stichus* 43 f.

Hans Lucas also regards *Stichus* 523 f. (Epignomus' return) as a free translation of fr. 13K, which Stobaeus quotes as from the *Adelphoi*; Kauer[3], however, had shown that fr. 13K is more suitable in the mouth of a slave, either Stichus or, as he suggests, Sangarinus; Sangarinus in fact greets Athens as '*nutrices Graeciae, . . . terra erilis patria*' (649). This identification is of great importance because it fixes the entrance of Sangarinus as part of Menander's *First Adelphoi*. Of the other *Adelphoi* fragments to which no place could be assigned in Terence' play, Kauer has argued cogently that fr. 11 belongs to the parasite's monologue in the *Stichus*. Fr. 8 remains a problem: 'Someone shouted for eight ladles of wine and twelve, until he had drunk his rivals under the table.' It is a description of a feast in the past; there are several parallels in Menander,[4] and

[1] Fr. 503K belongs to the context of *Stichus* 374 f.; fr. 504, 506-507 might be an answer of one of the wives to her father; fr. 505 belongs to one of the wives (cf. fr. 184K Pamphile in the *Epitrepontes*): the most uncertain is fr. 508K which may be part of Gelasimus' final speech (638 f.). The new fragment Ox. Pap. 1803: 'Collect all you have and buy a little farm' sounds like a piece of unkind advice to Gelasimus from one of the brothers.

[2] *Ph. W.* 1938, 1101.

[3] Edition of Terence, *Adelphi*, 6 n. 2. Enk, however, disagrees, *Mnemosyne*, 1916, 40.

[4] E.g. frs. 224, 226, 293, 607K.

many in the fragments of Middle Comedy;[1] the object is, not to gain courage for a *komos*, as in an otherwise similar fragment of Sophilos (fr. 4K)—if it were, it could be ascribed to an account of Aeschinus' dinner party in the *Second Adelphoi*—but to see who can last longest; the relevant parallel therefore seems to be a fragment of Menander's *Chalkeia* (fr. 510K): 'this is now the custom: they shouted "Unmixed in the big cup" and someone pledged them in the wine-cooler, ruining the poor devils.' There the tone is clearly critical and our fragment should belong to an account of the past life of the two brothers.

It is generally assumed that the end of the *Stichus* is an addition by Plautus from some other Greek play. No alternative ending for the *Adelphoi* has, however, as far as I know, been proposed; yet it can hardly end with Gelasimus' departure to commit suicide, and there is nobody to be recognised or married. The upstairs reconciliations have been effected; why should it not end with belowstairs junketings? Instances of feasting on the stage have already been quoted from Menander. The arrival of Sangarinus has considerable claims to be considered genuine and the one possible chronological indication[2] in the last act points to a play of Menander's time and not earlier. A further argument for genuineness can be found in the threads which lead back to the earlier part of the play. The curious little monologue of Stephanium (674 f.) has been regarded as a Plautine invention; but if Plautus took the end of the *Stichus* from another Greek comedy, it is difficult to see why he should want to show us Stephanium before her appearance at the feast (741), and why he should put her in the wrong house (674), when there is nothing in his play before to suggest how she got there.[3] But if the last act also belonged to the original, the scene becomes necessary; Stephanium has got into the wrong house because she accompanied her mistress Pamphila thither (676 = 536).

[1] E.g. Anaxandrides, fr. 2-3; Antiphanes, fr. 87, 145, 174, 185; Eubulus, fr. 37-38, 56; Alexis, fr. 168, 261K.

[2] *batiocis* (694) occurs Philemon fr. 87, Diphilus fr. 80K and in prose not before Aristotle. Cf. also Luschey, *Phiale*, 21. Suess, *Rh. Mus.*, 1910, 452 f. notes all the parallels in these closing scenes with Old Comedy, particularly with the *Ecclesiazusae* and *Plutus*.

[3] So also Dalman, *De aedibus scaenicis*, 17.

The downstairs junketings are inaugurated in the scene in which Stichus asks Epignomus for the day off (419-453). This scene has raised doubts on two counts:[1] first, the repetition of *age abduce hasce intro* (418, 435), which is regarded as a mark of insertion; secondly, the improbability of Epignomus remaining on the stage to listen to Stichus' monologue. The question is, however, not to be solved by excising the conversation between Epignomus and Stichus and the monologue of Stichus. If Plautus inserted these two passages after *abduce hasce intro* (418) and therefore kept Epignomus on the stage during Stichus' monologue, why did he put the second *abduce hasce intro* (435) in the middle of the insertion instead of at the end? We have seen already in discussing the *Karchedonios* that this kind of delaying has a parallel in Menander.[2] I see no reason to scrap the dialogue between master and slave. About the monologue I feel less certain; Epignomus evidently remains on the stage, because he does not announce that all is well at home until the next act (523); the monologue itself is full of repetitions and the apology for slaves feasting must be an insertion by the Roman poet (446-448).

One point, however, in the monologue of Stichus may well come from Menander and have been transferred from the dialogue. Stichus refers to the way through the garden between the houses, and the back door (437, 450). Dalman[3] has shown that garden and back door must be assumed for Canthara and the midwife in the *Second Adelphoi*, and in the *Phasma* Menander describes a special passage between two houses. Here the 'garden way' is extremely useful; Stichus uses it for his shopping and the sisters use it. We do not see anyone tell Pamphila that her husband has come, nor do we see Pamphila and Stephanium cross over to Epignomus' house, but we know from various references[4] that both these things happened. They

[1] See e.g. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*,[1] 151 f.; Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 111 f.; Enk, *Rev. Phil.*, 1938, 289.

[2] Cf. above on *Poenulus* 194: J. J. Tierney, *P.R.I.A.*, L (C), 52 notes similar repetitions round Menander's digressions in the *Perikeiromene*.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 93.

[4] 148; 536; 676. Pamphilippus also mentions and uses the garden way (614, 623).

could have been done on the stage, but they were not interesting, and therefore it was more convenient to use the garden way and explain Stephanium's presence in the wrong house when it became necessary. By these means the sisters appeared in the first two acts and the brothers in the next two acts ; a reunion of husband and wife on the stage is more necessary for modern than for ancient eyes ; the stage is no place for wives when husbands have returned.

The general shape of the latter part of the play seems clear : Act III—Arrival of Epignomus ; Stichus scenes ; Gelasimus scenes, ending with soliloquy of Gelasimus (497-504) ; Act IV —Arrival of Pamphilippus ; Antipho scenes ; Gelasimus scene ending with soliloquy of Gelasimus (632-640) ; Act V—Arrival of Sangarinus and slave junketings. The shape of the beginning of the play is less clear. Let us first put down the certainties : first, from the entry of Gelasimus (155) to his departure when Panegyris rejects his offer of assistance there is no break in the action—Gelasimus arrives, later Crocotium asks him to visit Panegyris, he waits and watches Pinacium arrive, and this scene leads up to a climax when he discovers that Epignomus has brought other parasites with him (385) ; therefore Act II begins before or with the arrival of Gelasimus (155). Secondly, Crocotium arrives from off stage to find Gelasimus in front of her mistress' house (196) ; it follows that the scene in which Crocotium was sent to find Gelasimus (150) belongs to Act I. Thirdly, Act I itself runs without a break at least from Antipho's introductory soliloquy (58) to the departure of Antipho, the return of the sisters to their houses, and the mission of Crocotium.[1]

The earlier part of Act I is more problematical. From hints we learn that the brothers have been away two years (30), that before they went away Antipho had quarrelled violently with them because of their poverty (132, 406 f.), and that they had lost their patrimony in wild living (628). This is a story which

[1] Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 287, also assumes that the division between the acts occurs here (154). I do not see why he objects (*op. cit.* 281) to Panegyris' intention of sending Gelasimus to the harbour ; it seems to me perfectly natural that in her nervousness she should not leave the whole responsibility to Pinacium (so also Enk, *Mnemosyne*, 1916, 28).

must have been told in the first act. The sisters probably do not know the full facts; Antipho knows them but Antipho comes out of his house for the first time at the beginning of the second scene (58), and if this scene is in its original shape (on which see below), it is difficult to see how there is room for a long narrative speech. Moreover, on the analogy of other prologues the audience should be told also of the brothers' successful return and something about the character of Antipho; this can only be done by a god; a fragment of the divine narrative about the past life of the brothers is perhaps preserved (fr. 8K). The most probable shape of the original seems therefore to have been: I. 1, dialogue of the two sisters (Pamphila visits Panegyris). This gives the emotional situation at the moment; the two sisters go into Panegyris' house (1-47). [I. 2, Divine monologue.] I. 3, Dialogue of sisters parallel to and balancing monologues of Antiphon (48-88). Parallel monologues are common enough at the beginning of scenes but normally take the form: monologue A, monologue B, conversation.[1] Here we have dialogue A, monologue B, dialogue A^1, monologue B^1, conversation; that the iambic *senarii* (48-57) open this scene is strongly suggested by the neat follow on from 'Let us then consider what is profitable for us to do' (57) to 'What do we do, sister, if our father refuses to listen to us' (68), and the clear break at the end of the *canticum* (47). Antipho's first speech (58 f.), although to a certain extent Romanised, becomes an essential part of this symmetrical structure.[2]

Antipho's second speech (75 f.) does not make sense as we read it in Plautus; he says that he is going to pretend that they have committed some fault and to use circumlocutions to frighten them (84). He then tells a most unterrifying fiction to 'test' them (126) and gives up the battle, saying 'I will go and tell your views to my friends' (143). This is clearly a procedure '*perplexim . . . leniter*' (76, 78).[3] If in a later scene, which Plautus

[1] E.g. *Heaut.* 874, *Aul.* 713; *Ep.* 243 f. is further complicated by the supervention of a third speaker, Syriskos. [2] Cf., however, Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 162.

[3] For *perplexim* cf. *circumitione*, *Andria* 202, regarded by Kuiper as an echo of E. *Phoen.* 494; Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 285 notes on 143 that Antipho cannot give up like this. The earlier lines (75-79) are well explained by Thierfelder, *Interpolationum*, 92 f.

scrapped, Antipho after further consultation with his friends proceeded directly and *minaciter*, we could understand that Menander contrasted both techniques in Antipho's monologue but Plautus remodelled this because he only wanted one scene. Remnants of the second Antipho scene survive in the Papyrus Didot a and frs. 504, 507; the only place for it and the natural place is at the beginning of the second act before the arrival of Gelasimus. This then gives the probable shape of the first act and the beginning of the second.

From the entry of Gelasimus the substratum is clearly Menander though individual passages show Plautine rehandling.[1] In particular, the entry of Pinacium is paralleled by the entrance of Geta in the *Adelphi* (299 f. cf. also fr. 741K) and his report of the news to the joy of Panegyris and the consternation of Gelasimus is an old tragic theme,[2] which recurs in the *Synaristosai* (*Cist.* 543 f.). As has been said, Pamphila is informed of the arrival of the brothers and transfers herself with Stephanium to the house of Panegyris by the garden way. There is no need for Antipho to be told the news; he probably heard it in the market-place and hurried thence to the harbour (408 f.).

IX. Other Plays.

Arrhephoros or Flute-Girl.

The double title indicates two characters (cf. *Hypobolimaios or Rustic*). The *Arrhephoros* had presumably been seen in the procession by the young man. She evidently had a child as a talkative nurse, Myrtile, is mentioned (66K). Somebody tries to dissuade the young man from marriage (65K), from the tone a friend rather than his father; compare perhaps the attitude of Kleinias in the *Misoumenos* (45). Two fragments belong to a slave intrigue: 69K, the young master complains that the slave Sosias has thought out a plot too daring to be safely carried out (cf. *Heautont.* 707); 67K, the slave tells the old man a story of

[1] Cf. e.g. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 289 on l. 155 f.; 284 n. 1 on l. 270 (add Thierfelder, *Interpolationum*, 48); 75 on l. 305; 228 on l. 316 f.

[2] Cf. Webster, *Introduction to Sophocles*, 91. Leo notes (*op. cit.*, 123) the close parallel between 325 f. and Aristophanes, *Plutus*, 641. Enk (*Mnem.* 1916) compares 374 ff. with *Birds*, 596 ff.

wild life in Byzantium presumably because he proposes to divert the money which the son has been sent to fetch (διὰ σέ). The role of the flute-girl remains obscure.

HEAUTON PENTHON.

Ulbricht[1] has shown that the fragments known as *Comoedia Florentina* are by Menander. The first title is likely to have been *Heauton Penthon* from the scene in the second act in which Chaereas decides to sham dead (the *Epitrepontes* also took its name from the second act). It may have had the second title of *Epikleros*, because the certain effect of Chaereas' feigned death would be to make his daughter an heiress, and Chaereas' will may have provided for the marriage of Chaereas' daughter to the boy as well as of Chaereas' stepson to the girl (a will was produced in the *Kanephoros*, Ribbeck, 86, II). As Tyche speaks the prologue a recognition is likely; the boy and girl are evidently twins whose father is unknown, like the children of the *Georgos*, *Heros*, *Hiereia*; their mother is dead and the obvious candidate for father is Smikrines; the mother was presumably related to the brothers (5)[2] and perhaps therefore Smikrines was their guardian, but only Chaereas honoured the relationship by taking pity on the girl. It seems certain that Smikrines and the slave Daos were seen before the prologue speech; Daos is presumably Chaereas' slave and had brought the gold and silver from Smikrines' house to Chaereas house. The gold and silver may be a treasure jointly owned by the brothers, or could possibly be the boy's property left in Smikrines' keeping; in either case it seems likely that Chaereas is giving it as a dowry to the girl. It is not certain from the phraseology whether the boy has appeared yet or not.

DEMIOURGOS.

The Demiourgos was a woman who looked after the arrangements for a marriage, including the food and the sacrifices. So here she congratulates a slave upon progress with the marriage

[1] *Kritische und Exegetische Studien*, 1 f.

[2] The assumption that the boy is (*a*) the son of a mother related to Smikrines and Chaereas, (*b*) not yet recognised as the son of Smikrines, answers Körte's question (lix): num sciebat Chaerea adulescentem sibi cognatum esse, Smicrines patrem se esse nesciebat?

arrangements (113K). As the slave claims to have been up all night, this is probably the opening scene and the presence of the Demiourgos accounts for the play's name. The fragments of Turpilius' *Demiurgus* (Ribbeck 90) tell us a little more; the young man loathes the prospect of marriage (Ribbeck III) like the young man in the *Georgos* (12) or Pamphilus in the *Andria*/*Perinthia* (328). He remembers with horror the bare ankles and long arms of the young woman (Ribbeck VII); the parallel here is again Pamphilus in the *Andria* (250) and Clitipho in the *Heautontimoroumenos* (1061). Ribbeck assumes that this same young man has been involved with a hetaira, who 'knew him for her own profit' (Ribbeck IV), left him 'stripped bare' (Ribbeck V), and is advised by someone to treat her lover well if she wishes him to stay (Ribbeck I). If this is right, then the nearest parallel would seem to be the *Truculentus*, where Diniarchus had been engaged to the girl when he raped her, had then deserted her for Phronesium, and finally married her; Callicles threatened legal proceedings (840), as apparently did the father in the *Demiourgos* (Ribbeck VI).

Dyskolos.

Pack[1] has shown that the hero was called Knemon and not Smikrines; Smikrines was the hero of the *Apistos*, the original of the *Aulularia*. The two plays were much alike both in the chief characters (the irritable man and the suspicious man) and in the setting (two houses and a shrine). But while Smikrines had a daughter, Knemon had a son (128K). The play opened with a night scene in which someone cannot sleep, presumably the son of Knemon who is worried about his love affair with a poor girl (137K, cf. 341K *Misoumenos*, 164K *Epikleros*, Ribbeck 65, VII, *Plokion*); Pan speaks the formal prologue (127K). Then I suggest that, as in the *Aulularia*, a rich neighbour visits Knemon and arranges for his daughter to marry Knemon's son; the arrangements go forward in spite of Knemon's objection to any sort of festivity or geniality (Aelian, *Ep. Rust.* 13; 129, 130, 136K)[2]

[1] *Classical Philology*, XXX, 1935, 131.

[2] Note however that all sources except *Etymol. Gud.* quote 136K from the *Hymnis*.

and in spite of Knemon's son, who appeals to his father to use his money to help him marry the poor girl (128K). Knemon is frightened and moves his gold to the shrine of Pan (134K) but it is discovered by a slave who makes off with it (133K). Meanwhile the poor girl's mother appeals to her brother-in-law, Knemon's rich neighbour (135K) cf. *Adelphi* 350 f. and presumably, again as in the *Aulularia*, the marriage is rearranged in favour of the poor girl.

THAIS.

Martial's epigram (XIV. 187) *nec Glycera pueri Thais amica fuit* is perhaps evidence that this was an early play. Propertius (IV, v, 42f.) makes it clear that Thais was the greedy type of hetaira. She tricked 'clever Getae' (presumably the slave of the young man; cf. *Eun.* 918 f., *Truc.* 699 f.). Geta perhaps tried to dissuade his master from pursuing Thais like Lydus in the *Dis Exapaton* (218K cf. *Bacch.* 117). Her door only opens if the nocturnal serenader has money. For money she accepts the unlovable soldier (cf. 732K) and the horny-handed sailor and the ex-slave. The young man in the prologue (217K) has evidently contrasted her with the good hetaira, who had been presented by Philemon (see Athenaeus, XIII, 594 f.).[1] 'She is utter disaster. Yet I think in spite of what she has made me suffer I would gladly have her now.' (Demianczuk 259/2).

THESAUROS.

The story of part of the play is preserved by Donatus (on Terence, *Eunuch*, 9). The only certain scene that can be derived from it is the trial scene in which the old miser claimed that he had buried the treasure during an alarm and the young man claimed that the treasure was his. What relation this has to the fragments (235-236K) which appear to refer to the follies of an old man in love is impossible to say.

THRASYLEON.

Thrasyleon was a 'wild soldier', whom Plutarch names with Thrasonides of the *Misoumenos*. With the few Greek fragments, the fragments of Turpilius' *Thrasyleon* (Ribbeck, 109) allow us to

[1] See on this Suess, *Rh. Mus.*, 1910, 449.

see the bare bones of the play which seems to have been somewhat like the *Kolax*. ' I want to see your wares ' (Ribbeck V) should be said by the soldier to a *leno*; to the *leno* also belongs the ingratiating (or threatening): ' as I have never yet given you any reward or profit for your kindness and loyalty ' (Ribbeck IX, cf. *Adelphi* 250). The young man (or his slave for him), presumably in trying to get the girl claims that (unlike Thrasyleon) he has ' never been seen drunk by day ' (Ribbeck II, cf. *Perik.* 112, *Eunuch* 480) and appeals to someone to pity the girl's orphanhood (Ribbeck X). The father is too proud to countenance such a marriage for his son (Ribbeck VIII), and the slave, despised by the soldier or his toady (244K, cf. *Eunuch* 486) and having failed in his first attempt (241K) has to think out a more elaborate stratagem to win the girl for his young master (242K, Ribbeck VI).

HIEREIA.

Our knowledge of this play is derived from a Summary and from two fragments. The priestess is a mother of twins; she kept the girl, but gave the boy (A) to a neighbour, who had only a daughter but later gave birth to a son (B). The father of the priestess' children had deserted (presumably before she became a priestess?), leaving some sort of tokens which the priestess buried (35 f.) until the children should grow up. The father came to the temple apparently for a cure, and overhearing the priestess meditating about her son suspected the truth (reading in 40 f.: *ἐπισκεπτομένης τὰ τοῦ παῖδος παρακούσας καὶ ἀπεικάσας τὰ πράγματα*); but the priestess does not recognise him. He then instructs his servant to feign ' possession ' so that he can come to the priestess as a patient and discover the truth. The working out of this plot should on the analogy of other plays take place in the second act. Probably at the end of this act the boy (B) sends his mother to the priestess to propose that he shall marry the priestess' daughter (cf. *Aul.* 682 f. and possibly *Kith.* 1 f.). The third act starts with the women talking as the neighbour leaves the priestess; the father overhears (cf. *Epitr.* 266 f.) and then receives a report from his servant. There follow the Comedy of Error scenes in which the father greets the wrong boy (B) as his son (cf. *Cist.* 305 f.). B then tells A that the father is

mad and is declaring all young men to be his sons. A therefore drives his father away when after due consideration his father claims him as his son (Körte well compares *Ion* 517 ff. for this scene). B now begins to suspect the truth (Körte : *ὑποψίαν* in 77), perhaps because he overhears the slave reflecting on the disastrous result of his report to his master (rather like Onesimos in the *Epitrepontes* 243, etc.). This should be the beginning of the fourth act in which the main recognition scene should occur. The next lines are fragmentary : B must make an investigation (*ἐξέ]τα[σε*) and would naturally ask his mother (*μή[τερα]*) ; similarly in the *Heautontimoroumenos* (1024 f.). Clitipho suggests to his mother that he may be a bastard. The truth must be established by recognition tokens which only the priestess can provide and the play ends with the triple marriage, father and priestess, A and neighbour's daughter, B and priestess' daughter. It is not clear how the only surviving fragment of any length (245K) fits into this story : Rhode is told that the rites of Cybele are merely inventions of mercenary men.[1] There is much to be said for Kuiper's suggestion (*Mnem.* 1940, 286) that Rhode is the neighbour and that these words as well as 546K are spoken to her in the prologue by her husband, who only returns at the end of the play to arrange the marriages (Kuiper reads in 83 *ἐξ ἀγρῶν δὲ τοῦ γείτονος ἐλθόντος*).

PAIDION.

This play has analogies with the *Demiourgos* (q.v.). The young man is involved with a rich hetaira who scorns his gifts (372-373K). If the fragments of Turpilius come from Menander,[2] we can perhaps guess that his father begs him to forget her (Ribbeck VIII, IV) and marry a girl who is educated, virtuous and honourable (Ribbeck V) ; the father is apparently prepared even to forego the marriage if the son will keep away from the hetaira (Ribbeck IX). It is presumably the father who is regarded as a monster of inhumanity (Ribbeck XI). The son has a friend

[1] Körte, *Hermes*, 1940, 108 assumes that these words are spoken by the husband to the priestess at the end of the play : they explain the reason for the husband having deserted the priestess.

[2] Note the likeness of 371K and Ribbeck X ; *Fab. Incert.* 20 and Ribbeck III.

who prefers social distinction to marriage (Ribbeck X; 371K, cf. on *Arrhephoros* above). His first attempts at keeping away from the hetaira seem to be unavailing (Ribbeck VII) but perhaps her greed finally breaks him (372-373K, cf. *Thais* and *Truculentus*); and the play ends with wedding bells (Ribbeck XII).

Appendix on Truculentus.

The *Truculentus* has been claimed for Menander and, in particular, Schoell (*Analecta Plautina*, 15 f.) has made an elaborate case for the *Sikyonios*, because the soldier in both is called Stratophanes: 442K must however refer to a soldier who has recently become rich (like Bias in the *Kolax*) and of this there is no trace in the *Truculentus*, nor are Schoell's explanations of any of the fragments, except the very general 443, 446K, convincing. The general parallels with Menander's hetaira plays are noted above under *Thais*, *Demiourgos*, *Paidion*. The following detailed parallels may be mentioned: *Truc.* 286 with 610K (Schoell); 342 f. with 114K; 352 f. with *Eun.* 81 f. (particularly 354 with *Eun.* 84, 372 with *Andr.* 959, 386 with *Eun.* 100); 433 with 381K (but cf. also Anaxilas 21K, Antiphanes 212K); 559 with 580K; 824 with 498K (note that 499K belongs to a similar context of confession); 831 with 627K (Schoell). In an early scene (which we must assume to make sense of 86 f.; Plautus has perhaps preserved some of it at 130) the baby was borrowed as in the *Samia* and the *Titthe* (unless these two should be identified); the scene in which Diniarchus and Phronesium discuss the baby (384 f.) has the same kind of irony as the Arbitration scene in the *Epitrepontes* (there the grandfather, here the father is ignorant of the baby's identity); the scene between Cyamus, Phronesium and Stratophanes (551 f.) is like a similar scene in the *Eunuch* (454 f.); Strabax' intervention on Phronesium and Stratophanes (925 f.) makes a situation which recurs in the *Misoumenos* and *Karchedonios*; Stratophanes' final attempt to get a share of Phronesium (962 f.) suggests Thraso's similar attempt at the end of the *Eunuch* (1054 f.). If the original was by Menander, *Phanion* and perhaps *Demiourgos* (cf. *Truc.* 825) are possible titles; in the *Thais* there is no place for the rustic Strabax; in the *Paidion*

the young man's father appeared; in the *Parakatatheke* the 'deposit' (or 'ward'?) must have been more important than Truculentus' *arrabo* (689). On the other hand it may be argued that the tone is not Menander: there is a complete absence of sympathy and no statement of positive values, the style is harder and more antithetic, the self-characterisation in the monologues is more direct and artless than in Menander. I do not therefore feel certain that the original was by Menander, but the likenesses are sufficient to justify using it to fill out the rather scrappy picture given by the fragments of Menander's hetaira plays.

ST. PAUL'S LETTER TO THE ROMANS—AND OTHERS.[1]

By T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A.,

RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

THE twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles describes the events which followed the termination of St. Paul's Ephesian ministry. We are told that after taking leave of the disciples he set out for Macedonia, where he carried out a preaching tour through the province while making his way to Greece (Ἑλλάς—the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament). Greece here probably means the Roman province of Achaea, and that in its turn may be taken to mean Corinth. The Apostle stayed in Greece for three months ; and it is fairly safe to assume that these were the winter months, which were unsuitable for travel. At the end of the three months he set out for Syria in accordance with plans which he had previously made.[2] It appears from Acts xix. 21 f. that he had framed a further project : after the visit to Jerusalem he must also see Rome. In Rom. xv. 14-33 he gives a fresh statement of his intentions, which confirms the plans already outlined in the Corinthian letters and in Acts, and adds further particulars. The journey to Jerusalem is imminent, if indeed it has not already begun.[3] Paul has serious misgivings, which events later more than justified, about the outcome of the visit. He is doubtful about the reception that he and his gift will have from 'the Saints', and he expects to be in danger from 'the unbelievers in Judaea', that is, from the active Jewish opponents of Christianity in Palestine, of whom he had formerly been a

[1] A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 11th of February, 1948.

[2] I Cor. xvi. 1-9 ; II Cor. i. 15 f. ; Ac. xix. 21 f.

[3] Rom. xv. 25. *νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.* Here *πορεύομαι* may mean 'I am going' or 'I am on my way'. Cf. Ac. xx. 22.

leader and in whose eyes he was an apostate of the worst kind.[1] He nevertheless hopes that by the prayers of himself and his friends he may come through and be able to carry out his plan of visiting Rome. There is one new feature: after Rome he proposes to start a missionary campaign in the far west. Spain is to be the scene of these new labours.[2]

All these data combine harmoniously to fix the time and place of the composition of Romans. It clearly belongs to the period of three months in Greece (Ac. xx. 2 f.) The controversies with members of the Corinthian church, which had caused Paul so much anxiety and grief during the Ephesian ministry, were now a thing of the past. The fundamental issues remained, of course, and on these Paul had not changed. But it was now possible to state the issues and set forth the essential truth of the matter without the heat and bitterness that had marked the earlier stages of the dispute. And this in fact is what Romans does. The first eleven chapters are devoted to a full-dress debate on the question which lay at the root of most of the troubles of the Ephesian ministry, the question, Can one be a good Christian without embracing Judaism? To this Paul's answer is that the real question, and the only question for Jews, is, Can one be a good Jew without embracing Christianity? The remainder of the didactic part of the document, xii. 1-xv. 13, is mainly occupied with the discussion of points that had arisen in the Corinthian correspondence. That is to say, Romans is the calm and collected summing-up of Paul's position as it had been hammered out in the heat of controversy during the previous months. It is a positive and constructive statement of his understanding of the Gospel.

An absolute dating of Romans is not possible. It involves forward reckoning from the date of Gallio's proconsulship at Corinth and back reckoning from the date of the replacement of Felix by Festus in the procuratorship of Judaea. The former date can be fixed within a year or so; the latter is more doubtful. This much, however, can be said: that the trial of Paul before Gallio is unlikely to have taken place earlier than the summer of

[1] Rom. xv. 30 ff. [2] Rom. xv. 23 f., 28.

A.D. 51. The earliest probable date for the beginning of the Ephesian ministry would then be 52; and this would mean that the three months' stay in Greece could hardly be earlier than the winter of 54-55. The latest date possible for the supersession of Felix would seem to be 61. This is the date defended by Eduard Meyer; but it is far from commanding universal assent.[1] Meyer places the three months' stay in Greece in the winter of 58-59, which is as late as it can well be put. Within those limits, then, late 54–early 59 the composition of Romans must fall. There seems to be a slight balance of probability in favour of the earlier end of this period.

But the real problems concerning Romans have not to do with date or place of origin but with destination. Put in its simplest form the question is this: Is the Epistle to the Romans, in the form in which it appears in our Bibles, from i. 1 to xvi. 27, a single composition made by St. Paul expressly for the Christian community in Rome and sent to them entire and complete as it now stands? Of course this general question only arises because a number of particular questions have emerged in the course of detailed study of the text of the document. They are concerned mainly with the first and the last two chapters.

The first seventeen verses of chapter i form the longest and most elaborate introduction to any Pauline epistle. We have first the prescript, a single sentence extending over seven verses (1-7) heavily encrusted with doctrinal embellishments, so that it becomes a miniature exposition of the Faith in itself. Then comes a second long passage (8-17) forming the transition from the prescript to the first main theme of the epistle. In both prescript and transition passage we have explicit mention of Rome. In verse 7, which forms the second item of the prescript formula, we read *πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις*. In verse 15 Paul expresses his readiness *καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι*. These clear references to Rome are supported by the great mass of the MSS. and other witnesses to the text; but there are a few dissentient voices. In

[1] Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, iii. 51-54. Cf. K. Lake in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 464-467, for a statement of the case for the date 55.

i. 7 we have the variant πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ offered by the Graeco-Latin MS. G. The Latin side of G (*g*) supports this reading in the omission of the reference to Rome, and offers alternative renderings of ἀγάπῃ : *in caritate uel dilectione dei.* The omission of Ῥώμῃ is also attested by a marginal note in MS. 1908 stating : τοῦ ἐν Ῥώμῃ οὔτε ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει οὔτε ἐν τῷ ῥητῷ μνημονεύει. That is, somebody who has written a commentary on Romans does not mention the words ' in Rome ' either in his exposition or in the text which he expounds. This commentator appears to have been Origen. The first stage of the corruption of the text is, then, the substitution of ' all who are in the love of God ' for ' all who are at Rome, beloved of God '. The next stage is the attempt to restore the reference to Rome in the corrupted text. This takes two forms : (*a*) *omnibus qui sunt Romae in caritate dei*, the reading of two Vulgate MSS., Fuldensis and Langobardus, of Pelagius,[1] perhaps also of Ambrosiaster, and of the Latin side (*d*) of Codex Claromontanus ;[2] (*b*) *omnibus qui sunt Romae in dilectione dei*, the reading of the two Vulgate MSS. Amiatinus and Ardmachanus.[3] These are rather obvious attempts to repair the damage that had been done when the reference to Rome was cut out. In i. 15 G again omits the reference to Rome by dropping τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ, and in this it is supported by its Latin side (*g*) which omits *qui Romae estis.* In D and *d* we get the following text :

καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι
et in nobis in Roma euangelizare.

[1] A. Souter, *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul : Text* (*Texts and Studies*, IX. 2), p. 9.

[2] On this cf. H. J. Vogels in *Amicitiae Corolla*, p. 283. ' Das Wort *romae* ist in einem Vorgänger von d eingefügt worden.'

[3] On *dilectio* and *caritas* as renderings of ἀγάπῃ see Hans v. Soden, *Das Lat. N.T. Afrika z. Z. Cyprians*, 67 ff. He points out that *dilectio* is the regular rendering in Tertullian and probably the earlier of the two in African use. It also seems to be the first choice, *caritas* being used in many cases merely for variety. On the other hand in the Vulgate *caritas* is the normal rendering in all N.T. books except the Fourth Gospel, which has *dilectio*. In a later study, *Der lat. Paulustext bei Marcion und Tertullian*, in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher*, he shows (p. 249) that the Latin version of Marcion's *Apostolikon* translated ἀγάπη by *dilectio*.

Here again we have what appears to be patchwork.[1] These repairs in D*d* go back to the sixth century, which is the date of the MS., and were probably already made in an ancestor of the MS. These and other facts mean, as Corssen[2] showed, that the three bilingual MSS. DFG should be regarded as descendants of a common ancestor from which the references to Rome in chapter i were absent.

Three conclusions follow from the examination of the text of Rom. i. 1-17: (*a*) that the omission of the references to Rome is ancient; (*b*) that it is wrong—the context, particularly verses 8-17, imperatively demands a particular reference to a well-known community not founded by Paul or hitherto visited by him; (*c*) that we have to do not with accidental loss but with deliberate excision—if 'in Rome' were missing in verse 7 or verse 15 it might be accident; but its absence in both places strongly suggests design. But who, it may be asked, would want to cut out the Roman address, and why? One answer, which has received considerable and I think undeserved acceptance is that the object was to turn a particular epistle into a general epistle; by removing the local reference, to make the document more catholic.[3] In support of this view appeal is made to the Muratorian Canon; but that document gives no real support: all it says is that letters addressed to individual churches have a message for the universal church, of which it is said *una tamen per omnem orbem terrae ecclesia diffusa esse dignoscatur* (ll. 55 ff.). Furthermore the theory does not explain why the generalising process was applied only to Romans, and possibly Ephesians, while all the other Pauline letters are left in their scandalous particularity.

The case of the letter to the Ephesians may or may not be relevant: it should, however, be briefly noticed at this point. Here we have another case where the textual authorities do not agree about the address of the letter. The great mass of the witnesses, including the versions, favour Ephesus as the destination. The minority is divided. On the one side $P^{46}B^{*}\aleph^{*}$, the

[1] See Vogels, *op. cit.* 283 f.

[2] *ZNW* X (1909), 1-45, 97-102.

[3] See, for example, Wendland, *HBNT*, I. 3, 351 n. 3. Lietzmann, *HBNT: An die Römer*, p. 27.

corrector of 424, Origen, and Basil omit any local reference : on the other the Marcionite *Apostolikon* contains the epistle under the title ' To the Laodiceans '.[1] Of these three possibilities it may be said that ' Ephesus ' is probably wrong—the internal evidence of the epistle is against it—and probably very early, seeing that it appears in all the versions. Secondly the authorities for the omission of a place-name are in the main Alexandrian : the earliest of them, Origen and P^{46}, take us back to the third century. Thirdly the Marcionite address to the Laodiceans goes back at least to the second century. We are left with questions to which no certain answers can be given. Is the omission of a place-name a piece of higher criticism by someone who saw the objections to ' Ephesus ' (or ' Laodicea '), or is it the primitive text (and so probably evidence that Ephesians was a circular letter)? Is ' Ephesians ' a very early bad guess or does it reflect the fact that the circular letter ended its travels at Ephesus? What had Marcion before him? Did he displace ' Ephesus ' in favour of ' Laodicea '? Or fill in a blank space with ' Laodicea '? Or was ' Laodicea ' already there?

We do not know, but we may try to guess. My guess, for what it is worth, starts from the fact that these problems of address are peculiar to Romans and Ephesians, and that it is at Rome and Ephesus that Marcion received two great and humiliating rebuffs. It is conceivable that Marcion may have considered that the two churches that had contemptuously rejected the one man who really understood St. Paul had thereby forfeited their status as recipients of a letter from the Apostle. This is no more than a conjecture ; and it is time now to turn to the consideration of other factors in the problem of Romans. In view, however, of the fact that so many of the clues lead back to Marcion, it may be worth while to keep the conjecture in mind.

The second main group of problems is concerned with the last two chapters of Romans. On these, a very full and careful statement of the progress of research down to 1929 was given

[1] There is a careful discussion of this problem by E. Percy in his *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*, 449-466.

by Schumacher.[1] The fact that there is a problem was perceived as early as the eighteenth century by Semler; and the debate has continued ever since. Since Schumacher wrote matters have been further complicated by the discovery of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistle (P^{46}), and my chief concern is to reconsider the problem of the last two chapters in the light of the new evidence furnished by P^{46}. We may begin by setting out the essential facts.

First, the structure of the Epistle. After the prescript (i. 1-7) and the transition paragraph (i. 8-17), both of which we have already discussed, we come to the first main topic, Judaism and Christianity, which occupies i. 18-xi. 36 and concludes with a doxology (verses 33-36). This is followed by the second main section dealing with practical problems of Christian Ethics. This extends from xii. 1 to xv. 13, and is concluded by a benediction (verse 13). The remainder of chapter xv, verses 14-33 is occupied with personal matters, details of Paul's missionary activity in the past and his plans for the future. It is clearly addressed to the Roman community, and it ends with a short benediction (verse 33). Chapter xvi begins with a commendation of one Phoebe, deaconess in the church at Cenchreae near Corinth (verses 1-2). Verses 3-16 and 21-23 are taken up with greetings to various named persons and greetings from others. The two sets of greetings are separated by a passage in which the recipients are solemnly warned against false teachers. This passage seems to presuppose some personal acquaintance of the Apostle with those to whom it is addressed. It closes with a blessing (verse 20*b*) whose position is not certain. It appears in the MS. tradition in three places: here at the end of the warning passage; as verse 24 after the second list of greetings; and, finally, after the doxology (verses 25-27). Along with the varying positions go slight differences of wording. Without attempting at the moment to solve the problem of the proper place of this last benediction it may be remarked that these numerous full closes occur in the places where we should expect to find

[1] R. Schumacher, *Die beiden letzten Kapitel des Römerbriefes* in *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, edited by Meinertz, xiv. Band. 4 Heft. Münster i. W. 1929.

them : xi. 33-36 ; xv. 13, 33 ; and xvi. 20 or 24 or 27. Whatever views we may hold about the unity of the document, these are the logical places for major pauses.

But this sensible and natural division is crossed by another, which has left its mark in the textual tradition of the Epistle. This second system is marked by the position of the final doxology *τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι . . . . ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν*. It is widely held that this doxology is an interpolation originating in Marcionite circles, though not the work of Marcion himself. With this opinion I am inclined to agree. But whether it be genuine or not, it seems to be intended as the concluding word of the text. Now this doxology appears in three different places in the textual tradition of Romans : at the end of chapters xiv, xv, and xvi. In two of these cases it comes where there is a real full close already in the text, namely after xv. 33, at the end of the personal statement to the Roman community ; and at the close of the second set of greetings in chapter xvi. The position after xv. 33 is attested by the Chester Beatty Codex, P^{46}, the first and, so far, the only witness to this position. The position at the end of xvi is supported by the leading Alexandrian MSS. ℵBC as well as by the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, the Vulgate, the Peshitta, the Latin version of Origen's commentary and the Athos MS. (1739) based on the Greek Origen, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius. The position at the end of chapter xiv is supported by the common run of later (Byzantine) MSS. along with L, the Harklean Syriac, the Gothic, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The essence of this position is that it is not one of the natural logical pauses in the epistle. The insertion of the doxology after xiv. 23 produces a break in the continuity of the text. It is very unlikely that any thinking person with the complete text of Romans as far as xv. 13 before him would have thought of putting the doxology at xiv. 23. The natural inference is that when the doxology was attached to xiv. 23, it was attached to a form of the text which ended at that point.

This conclusion is confirmed by other pieces of evidence. There is first the table of contents in the Codex Amiatinus of the Vulgate. This divides the epistle into 51 sections of which the fiftieth quite clearly refers to the last paragraph of chapter

xiv. (verses 13-33), and the fifty-first to the doxology. This capitulation is older than the MS. in which it appears ; for this MS. gives the complete text of Romans with the doxology at the end of chapter xvi. Again in the Codex Fuldensis of the Vulgate we have an even more remarkable capitulation, or rather one and a half capitulations. The first one covers chapters i to xiv in twenty-three sections : it implies probably a form of the text from which the last two chapters were absent. It tells us nothing about the doxology. Having covered fourteen chapters in this way in twenty-three sections, the capitulation now goes back to the beginning of chapter ix and gives sections 24 to 51 of the capitulation of Amiatinus. To the evidence of these tables we can add that of three MSS. of the Vulgate—in Gregory's notation 1648 and 1792 (both of Munich) and 2089 (of the Monza Chapter Library). In these the text ends at xiv. 23 and is followed by a short benediction and the doxology. It is to be noted that this is all Latin evidence.[1]

To this we can add some further facts and inferences. It is a fact that the Graeco-Latin MS. G does not have the doxology in any of the three places ; and it is practically certain from the researches of Corssen that the ancestor from which DFG all descend did not have the doxology anywhere. Corssen has also made it probable that this ancestor of DFG, which he calls Z, had a 'Western' text in chapters i-xiv, and one with a considerable number of peculiar readings in the last two chapters. From this fact he inferred that behind Z lay a MS. which had the short text of Romans (i-xiv) without the doxology.

How did it come about that a text ending at xiv. 23 existed? It cannot be the work of the author ; for he would not have cut the text in the middle of an argument, and he himself shows that the proper place for a cut would be at xv. 13. We must suppose that some other hand was responsible ; and we are not left to guess whose hand it was. We have the direct assertion of Origen that it was Marcion who cut the last two chapters of Romans.[2]

[1] The Capitulations are printed in full in the great Oxford edition of the Vulgate New Testament, vol. II, pp. 44-61. For the details regarding the three MSS. of the Vulgate see Schumacher, *op. cit.* 15.

[2] For the text of Origen and a full discussion of its interpretation see Schumacher, *op. cit.* 3-10.

Tertullian can also be called as a witness that Marcion's text of Romans ended at xiv. 23 or thereabouts. Origen quotes xiv. 23 and tells us that Marcion from that point *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*. How much is *cuncta*? No doubt for Origen it meant the whole of the last two chapters, for he was acquainted with a text of Romans similar in extent to that in our Bibles. It was natural to assume that the difference between the text known to Origen and the text of Marcion represented the extent of Marcion's cut. But it is not at all certain that the text on which Marcion operated was Origen's text. The fact is that we know what was left when Marcion had finished his work on Romans: we can only guess what was there when he started. Harnack was of the opinion that at this point Marcion had before him a text from which the last two chapters were already absent.[1] This seems to me to be very unlikely.

The whole question is set in a new light by the publication of the third century Codex of the Pauline Epistles (P^{46}).[2] Here we have the oldest Greek MS. of Paul; and it gives the doxology at the end of chapter xv, that is, at the end of the personal notes addressed to the Roman church. The clear implication is that there was once—at an earlier date than the date of P^{46}—a form of the text which omitted chapter xvi.

Now more than a century before the discovery of P^{46} the hypothesis had been put forward by David Schulz that Rom. xvi is no part of what St. Paul wrote to Rome but is a fragment of a Pauline letter to the Ephesian church.[3] This hypothesis had been accepted on internal grounds by many scholars; but it remained a conjecture unsupported by MS. evidence. Now the required testimony was provided by the oldest known

[1] Harnack, *Marcion* (1921), 145* f.

[2] This MS. belongs part to Mr. Chester Beatty and part to the University of Michigan. The part of Romans that concerns us is in the Michigan portion. It was published by Professor H. A. Sanders in 1935 (*A Third-century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*). Plate III of this edition gives a facsimile of the page containing Rom. xv. 30-33; Doxology; xvi. 1-3. The complete text of the Pauline corpus as given by the Michigan and Chester Beatty leaves was published by Sir Frederic Kenyon in 1936. (*The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasc. III Supplement. Pauline Epistles.*)

[3] Schumacher, *op. cit.* 63. He gives the reference to *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1829, 609 ff.

MS. of the Epistles. The natural inference to be drawn is that we are here in the presence of the form of text that was sent to Rome in the first instance. But, if Harnack is right, 'Marcion did not edit his Apostolikon in Pontus or Asia, but in the west. The text that lay before him was thus the text of the Roman community shortly before the middle of the second century.'[1] In that case we are justified in supposing that what Marcion removed from the text of Romans was what we now know as chapter xv. Chapter xvi he could not touch, for it was not there: it formed no part of the text known at Rome in the second century. This view is consistent with the evidence from western patristic sources. We have no quotation from Rom. xv-xvi in Irenaeus, Tertullian, or Cyprian. There is, however, an indication in the Muratorian Canon which suggests a possible acquaintance with Rom. xv. There an explanation is being offered of the absence of any account in Acts of St. Paul's missionary journey to Spain. The explanation is not that it did not take place, but that Luke was not present when the Apostle set out, and therefore did not report the departure. The point is that the Muratorianum uses the uncommon form Spania instead of Hispania, and that Σπανία is the word used by Paul in xv. 24 and 28 in describing the plans for his future activities.

On the assumption that Marcion removed chapter xv, and that only, we have to attempt to discover some motive for the excision. Here I venture to suggest that the same motive that I have already put forward to explain the removal of local references in Rom. i. 7, 15 and Eph. i. 1, will serve to explain the removal of the personalia in Rom. xv. 14-33. It remains to find a reason for breaking off at xiv. 23 the argument which runs naturally on to xv. 13. If we may judge from Marcion's treatment of other parts of Romans, particularly his omission of chapter iv, with its detailed appeal to the Old Testament story of Abraham, and of most of chapters ix-xi, with their frequent appeals to the Old Testament, we may perhaps suppose that he found the repeated quotations of Old Testament texts in xv. 1-13 uncongenial, as well as the idea (xv. 4) that 'whatsoever things were

[1] Harnack, *op. cit.* 127*.

written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope'. Moreover, it may be considered that from the Marcionite point of view the statement of xiv. 23 that 'whatever is not of faith is sin' makes a more decisive conclusion to the argument than anything the Pauline continuation can offer.

If the argument up to this point is sound certain conclusions seem to follow, which are not without importance for the textual criticism of the Pauline epistles. First of all we must regard all MSS. which present the doxology after xiv. 23 as at least open to the suspicion of having a Marcionite streak in their ancestry. This may seem to be a surprising conclusion in view of the fact that so many of these MSS. belong to the Byzantine or Koine group. We must, however, bear in mind that in many cases the streak in question may be no more than the insertion of the doxology at that point. Further, as the major part of Marcion's activity consisted in excisions, it is quite possible that a text originally Marcionite, in the process of having its omissions supplied, might also be revised in other respects and so brought into closer agreement with a different type of text. It has also to be remembered that at the time when Marcion was active the number of MSS. of the Pauline corpus was small, and probably very small. Consequently his Apostolikon may easily have been the source from which many copies were taken simply because there was no other text available.

The second conclusion is that we should regard P^{46} as offering in chapters i-xv the form in which the epistle was received at Rome; and, what is perhaps more important, its text should be taken as descended from the pre-Marcionite Roman text of the letter. It may not be a very pure example of the text. It has suffered the interpolation of the doxology and the addition of chapter xvi. But at any rate it has a pre-Marcionite Roman base. This makes it a very important and valuable witness.

Thirdly we should note that P^{46} has chapter xvi attached after the doxology. In view of the fact that P^{46} comes from Egypt, and that it is the Alexandrian textual witnesses that testify to the longest form of text by having the doxology at the end of chapter xvi, and further that our earliest patristic writer

to show certain knowledge of chapter xvi is Clement of Alexandria, it may be permissible to guess that this last chapter was added to the pre-Marcionite Roman text underlying P^{46} in Egypt. In favour of such a hypothesis it may be noted that the text of chapter xvi in P^{46} seems to stand nearer to the B type than does the text of other chapters of the epistle.

So much for the text. What can be deduced from these facts about the history of the letter? The first thing that emerges is that in the second half of the second century the document was circulating in three forms: the Marcionite, which had no reference to Rome and ended at xiv. 23; the Roman, which ended at xv. 33; and the full text of sixteen chapters which was in circulation in Egypt and was known to Clement of Alexandria. It is our view that Marcion produced his text from the Roman by the removal of chapter xv and of the references to Rome in i. 7 and 15. If we eliminate Marcion from the reckoning we are left with two forms of text: a Roman of fifteen chapters and an Egyptian of sixteen. Our problem is to account for the existence of these two types of text. It is here that the hypothesis that chapter xvi is a letter, or part of a letter, to Ephesus comes in.

This hypothesis had been the subject of much debate from its first suggestion by David Schulz in 1829. It is not necessary to go over all the ground again. The arguments are stated in the Introductions to the New Testament and the commentaries on Romans.[1] The major points are that chapter xvi contains a large number of greetings to Paul's friends. It is unlikely that he had so many personal friends—some of them intimate friends—in the Roman church which he had never visited. Further, those in the list, who are otherwise known, are connected with Asia and Ephesus. Again the exhortations in xvi. 17-20 read very oddly if they are taken to be addressed to a church to which Paul was a stranger: they are very natural things to say to a community which he had founded and in which he had worked for several years. On the other side comes Lietzmann's acid

[1] For a clear and fair statement of the case before P^{46} came on the scene, see Dodd's *Commentary on Romans* (1932), pp. xvii-xxiv.

comment on the theory that Rom. xvi is a letter to Ephesus: 'A letter consisting almost entirely of nothing but greetings . . . is a monstrosity'.[1] There is further the fact that a detailed study of the names in chapter xvi leads to the conclusion that they *could* have been the names of members of the Roman church in the first century. Professor Dodd concluded (p. xxiv) 'It is clear that the arguments for Rome and Ephesus respectively come far short of proof one way or the other. As the burden of proof rests upon those who would set aside the tradition in favour of a conjecture, we may be content to accept chap. xvi (except the doxology) as an integral part of the epistle.'

That was certainly a fair summing up of the argument in 1932. In 1935, however, came the new evidence of P^{46} to set the whole matter in a new light. The position of the doxology in this MS. was a clear enough indication that Romans had once existed in a form which ended where the upholders of the Ephesian theory said it ought to end. They could now buttress their conjecture by the evidence of the earliest known MS. of the Pauline corpus. This means that the Ephesian theory now has a stronger claim than ever before to the most serious consideration. Suppose that it is true.

We must then suppose that Paul prepared a letter (Rom. i-xv) and sent it to Rome. At the same time a copy was prepared to be sent to Ephesus. It may be assumed that this Ephesian copy would include the personalia of Rom. xv. 14-33; for these, though primarily intended for the Roman Church, nevertheless contained information about Paul's plans which would certainly be of interest to the Apostle's friends in Ephesus. As all this was given in i-xv it was unnecessary to say much more in the added paragraphs. Consequently all that we have in chapter xvi is an introduction of Phoebe, who may be regarded as the bearer of the letter to Ephesus; the greetings to Paul's friends in the province of Asia; and the exhortation of verses 17-20, which has points of contact with Paul's address to the Ephesian elders at Miletus.[2] Any further information that was

[1] *HBNT. An die Römer*[3], 129.

[2] Acts xx. 17-38. Compare Rom. xvi. 17 f. with Acts xx. 29-32.

asked for at Ephesus could doubtless be supplied verbally by the bearer of the letter.[1] Naturally the covering note (xvi) and the Roman letter (i-xv) were associated from the beginning and presumably they formed a single document, which was preserved as such in the archives of the Ephesian community. From Ephesus copies reached Egypt at an early date, and the sixteen chapters were well known to Clement of Alexandria as well as to the translators of the Sahidic version.[2]

Meanwhile the Roman letter (i-xv) made its way to its destination. It was doubtless preserved in the archives of the Roman church, and a copy of it may have been known to the author of the Muratorian Canon. From this Roman text Marcion, in the first half of the second century, prepared his text ending at xiv. 23. This became the standard text of the Marcionite communities, which were strongest and survived longest in Syria.[3]

The rest of the history of the text is concerned largely with the intermixture of these types of text. P^{46} itself is one of the earliest examples: a Roman text supplemented from the Ephesian text current in Egypt. Another mixture is represented by AP 533 where the doxology appears in the Marcionite position and the Ephesian.

Returning now to Paul at Corinth, we may ask one final question concerning the motive for the writing of the letter. So long as the letter was thought of as a simple letter to Rome the obvious answer to the question was to the effect that it was a rather elaborate and detailed statement of faith offered by the Apostle as evidence on which the Roman church might give him a friendly reception and set him forward on his Spanish mis-

[1] Such verbal supplements to the written document are contemplated in Col. iv. 7 ff. and Eph. vi. 21 f.

[2] For this transmission of Christian material from Asia to Egypt we have striking evidence in the John Rylands Library. The Rylands fragment of John (P. Ryl. Gk. 457) is proof that the Ephesian Gospel had reached Egypt within a few decades of its composition; and this evidence is confirmed by the British Museum papyrus, P. Egerton 2, containing a fragment of an apocryphal gospel, which clearly is dependent on John, and equally clearly was in existence within a few decades of the composition of John.

[3] It may be noted that it is in this area that evidence is strongest for the existence of the doxology in what may be called the Marcionite position, after xiv. 23.

sionary enterprise. But this answer needs reconsideration in the light of the conclusions so far reached in our discussion. It seems to me that we must begin from the facts (*a*) that the text of Romans was produced at Corinth, and (*b*) that it was sent both to Rome and to Ephesus.

(*a*) With regard to the Corinthian origin, we have to note that the document was produced immediately after the close of a period of bitter and violent controversy over matters affecting the church at Corinth and the churches of Galatia, and in all probability the Macedonian churches too. The central issue in this controversy was that of the relation between Judaism and Christianity, Law and Gospel. This issue is hotly debated in Galatians and in Philippians iii, more calmly in 2 Cor. iii-vi; and finally it is discussed at length in a careful and judicial way in the first eleven chapters of Romans. These chapters may fairly be regarded as Paul's considered judgement on the whole issue. Now when we turn to the text of these chapters and study the argument in detail it is difficult to avoid the impression that we have here the report of a real debate. Again and again Paul is answering objections and meeting criticisms of his position. Are these imaginary objections and hypothetical criticisms? Or are they points which were actually made in real debate? I am inclined to think that we have here a record made by Paul and his clerical helpers of a real discussion. The order and arrangement of the account is probably Paul's own; but the materials used in putting it together may well have come in large part from the actual debate.

This impression is confirmed when we turn to the sections dealing with Christian practice (xii. 1-xv. 13). Chapter xii takes up the question of unity within the church and stresses afresh the organic conception of the Christian community, a very necessary idea at Corinth where the church had been rent by party divisions. Chapter xiii. 1-10 deals with the relation of the church to the civil power, a matter that had arisen in another connexion in I Cor. vi. Chapter xiii. 11-14 touches on matters dealt with at greater length in I Cor. xv. And finally xiv. 1-xv. 13 rediscusses the problems which were earlier considered in I Cor. viii-x.

These facts seem to me to lead to the conclusion that we should think of our document primarily as the summing up of the positions reached by Paul and his friends at the end of the long controversy whose beginnings appear in I Corinthians and—if the Ephesian dating of Philippians is, as I think it is, right—in Philippians iii. Having got this statement worked out to his own satisfaction, Paul then decided to send a copy of it to his friends in Ephesus, which he did not intend to visit on his way to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 16). This copy would be available for the information of all the churches of Asia. At the same time he conceived the idea of sending a copy to Rome with a statement of his future plans. It might be permissible to guess that a written record may have remained in Corinth, though that, I think, is not necessary on the assumption that the substance of what is now in Romans had been gone over in discussion with the members of the Corinthian community. The situation then is that the Corinthian church has had the Apostle's summing up by word of mouth ; the church in Syria and Palestine may expect to hear it in the same way in the near future. The church in the province of Asia and the church in Rome will receive it in writing. Looked at in this way Romans ceases to be just a letter of self-introduction from Paul to the Roman church, and becomes a manifesto setting forth his deepest convictions on central issues, a manifesto calling for the widest publicity, which the Apostle did his best—not without success—to give it.

THE CHINESE PHILOSOPHER MO TI.[1]

By HAROLD H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

THE names of Confucius and his great exponent Mencius and of Lao-tzŭ, the founder of Taoism,[2] are familiar in the West but the name of Mo Ti [3] is little known. In Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* he received brief mention in a single column.[4] Until 1922 the books associated with his name were untranslated into any European language, save for the chapters on Universal Love—which Legge had printed in Chinese and

[1] A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 10th of December, 1947.

[2] Whether the Lao-tzŭ who founded Taoism was contemporary with Confucius, as has been traditionally supposed, is now much disputed by Chinese scholars, and is increasingly doubted by Western scholars. Cf. Forke, *Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie*, 1927, pp. 249-255, where it is held that at the latest Lao-tzŭ belonged to the period of Mo-tzŭ. Similarly, Y. L. Fung (*History of Chinese Philosophy* i, 1937, pp. 170-172) places the founder of Taoism in the same post-Confucian period, and holds that this founder, whose name was Li-Êrh, has been confounded with a legendary figure, Lao Tan. Cf. also A. Waley, *The Way and its Power*, 1934, pp. 86, 101 ff., and E. R. Hughes, *Chinese Philosophy in Classical Times*, 1942, p. 144, the former dating the *Tao Tê Ching* in the third century B.C., and the latter somewhat hesitatingly at the end of the fourth century B.C. In close agreement with this last date is the view of H. Dubs, who places Lao-tzŭ *circa* 300 B.C. (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, lxi, 1941, pp. 215 ff.; cf. the subsequent discussion with D. Bodde, *ibid.*, lxii, 1942, pp. 8 ff., 300 ff., and lxiv, 1944, pp. 24 ff.). Krause, *Ju-Tao-Fo*, 1924, pp. 136, 544, questions the tradition in a far more hesitating way.

[3] The name of this philosopher stands in a great variety of forms in European works, as will be seen in the references below. The first word stands variously as Mo, Mê, Mei, Meh, Mih and Mu, while the second stands as Ti, Tih or Teih. He is also frequently referred to as Mo-tzŭ, which means the philosopher Mo, and here again we find Motze, Motse and various other forms. A latinized form, Micius—formed on the same principle as Confucius from K'ung-tzu and Mencius from Mêng-tzŭ—is also found in some works.

[4] See under Micius in vol. viii, 1915, pp. 623 f. This article is by P. J. Maclagan. Couling's *Encyclopaedia Sinica*, 1917, contains less than a column on Mo-tzŭ (p. 383), while the German encyclopaedia, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 2nd ed., 5 vols., 1927-1931, contains no article devoted to him.

rendered into English in the Introduction to the second volume of his edition of the Chinese Classics [1]—and a few selected passages incorporated in translation in some of the relatively few books and articles devoted to Mo-tzŭ. Yet he is described by a distinguished contemporary Chinese scholar as 'perhaps one of the greatest souls China has ever produced'.[2]

In 1922 Forke translated into German the surviving texts called by his name, and prefaced the translation with a long and valuable Introduction.[3] Five years later Tomkinson issued an English translation of a larger selection of the chapters than had appeared before in English, together with a brief Introduction[4] and in 1929 Mei Yi-pao published an English version of most of the surviving chapters,[5] followed a few years later by a separate volume of Introduction.[6] In addition to these works, however, there are a number of shorter studies in European languages, mediating some knowledge of the philosopher and his work. The earliest book by a European writer devoted entirely to the exposition of Mo-tzŭ's teaching was published in German by E. Faber,[7] while articles in journals or sections of books appeared at very rare intervals from 1859 to 1896.[8] More recently a few

[1] Cf. 'The Opinions of Mih Teih', in *The Chinese Classics*, ii, *The Works of Mencius*, 1861, Prolegomena, pp. 103-125; or 'The Opinions of Mo Tî', in the second edition of the same, 1895, pp. 100-122. (The second edition of this work will alone be cited below).

[2] Cf. Hu Shih, *The Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China*, 1928, p. 55.

[3] Cf. A. Forke, *Mê Ti, des Sozialethikers und seiner schüler philosophische Werke*, 1922.

[4] Cf. L. Tomkinson, *The Social Teachings of Meh Tse* (Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan, 2nd series, iv, 1927).

[5] Cf. Y.P. Mei, *The Ethical and Political Works of Motse*, 1929. The chapters on Logic and Defence have not been included in this translation.

[6] Cf. *id.*, *Motse: the Neglected Rival of Confucius*, 1934.

[7] Cf. Faber, *Die Grundgedanken des alten chinesischen Sozialismus, oder die Lehre des Philosophen Micius*, 1877. This work contains extracts from the chapters, together with the translator's observations. It was translated into English in 1897 by Dr. Kupfer, but I have not had access to this translation.

[8] Cf. J. Edkins, 'Notices of the character and writings of Mêh Tsî', in *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, ii, 1859, pp. 165-169; S. Cognetti de Martiis, 'Un Socialista Cinese del V secolo av. C., Mih Teih', in *Memorie della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, 4th series, Classe de Scienze morali, iii, 1887, pp. 248-281; J. J. M. de Groot, *The Religious System of China*, ii, Book i,

short monographs have been published,[1] while a number of general works have devoted some pages to this sage,[2] and a few short articles have appeared in journals [3] and elsewhere.[4]

It is more surprising that Mo-tzŭ has been little known in

1894, pp. 664-685; C. de Harlez, 'Mi Tze, le philosophe de l'amour universel', in *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, viii, 1894, pp. 103-126; *id.*, 'Mi Tze: l'amour universel', *ibid.*, ix, 1895-1896, pp. 81-126 (continuing the foregoing, and incorporating translations of considerable portions); L. de Rosny, 'Une grande lutte d'idées dans la Chine antérieure à notre ère, Meng-tze, Suin-tse, Yang-tse et Meh-tse', in *Études de Critique et d'Histoire* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences Religieuses, vii), 1896, pp. 277-301. (Forke (*Mê Ti*, pp. 14 f.) notes one or two others to which I have not had access.)

[1] Cf. Alexandra David, *Socialisme Chinois: le Philosophe Meh-Ti et l'idée de Solidarité*, 1907; Hoang Tsen-yue, *Étude comparative sur les philosophies de Lao Tseu, Khong Tseu, Mo Tseu* (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, N.S. ii, Fasc. 37), 1925—the pages devoted to Mo-tzŭ being pp. 95-149; H. R. Williamson, *Mo Ti: a Chinese Heretic*, 1927; J. Witte, *Mê Ti, der Philosoph der allgemeinen Menschenliebe und sozialen Gleichheit im alten China*, 1928; S. Holth, *Micius: a brief Outline of his Life and Ideas*, 1935.

[2] Cf. D. T. Suzuki, *Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy*, 1914, pp. 92-100; L. Wieger, *Histoire des croyances religieuses et des opinions philosophiques en Chine*, 1922, pp. 207-212 (English translation by E. C. Werner, 1927, pp. 207-212); R. Wilhelm, *Die chinesischen Literatur*, 1926, pp. 56-61; A. Forke, *Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie*, 1927, pp. 368-395; Hu Shih, *Development of the Logical Method in Ancient China*, 1928, pp. 53-82; Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *History of Chinese Political Thought*, 1930, pp. 93-112; L. Wieger, *Textes philosophiques*, 2nd ed., 1930, pp. 175 f. (containing two brief extracts of the Chinese text of Mo-tzŭ, together with French translation); M. Granet, *La pensée chinoise*, 1934, pp. 490-500; Y. L. Fung, *History of Chinese Philosophy*, 1937, pp. 76-105; A. Waley, *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China*, 1939, pp. 163-181; E. R. Hughes, *Chinese Philosophy in Classical Times*, 1942, pp. 43-67; F. T. Cheng (Chêng T'ien-hsi), *China Moulded by Confucius*, 1946, pp. 110-116; Y. L. Fung, *The Spirit of Chinese Philosophy*, 1947, pp. 34-44.

[3] Cf. H. Maspero, 'Notes sur la logique de Mo-tseu et de son école', in *T'oung Pao*, xxv, 1928, pp. 1-64; W. Wallace, 'Religious Elements in the Writings of Motse', in *Chinese Recorder*, lxii, 1931, pp. 557-561; C. O. Simpson, 'Motse and Fatalism', *ibid.*, pp. 638-645; G. Kennedy, 'Ethical and Social Teachings of Moti', *ibid.*, pp. 695-702; F. Rawlinson, 'The Ethical Values of Micius', *ibid.*, lxiii, 1932, pp. 93-102; L. Tomkinson, 'Pacifist and Socialist Intellectuals in the "Warring States"', *ibid.*, lxvii, 1936, pp. 286-296.

[4] Cf. Z. L. Yih, 'Introduction to Mo-Tzu', in *Hirth Anniversary Volume*, 1923, pp. 613-619. There have also been a few short contributions in Russian, but these are inaccessible to me by reason of their language. I have dealt with some aspects of the teaching of Mo-tzŭ in 'The Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule', in the BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, xxiv, 1940, pp. 321-352, and *Submission in Suffering: a comparative study of Eastern Thought*, 1942.

China until modern times. There were a few scattered references to him in the writings of Mencius and other ancient authors, but the texts in which his teachings were enshrined lay forgotten and neglected. Yet there was a time when his influence rivalled that of Confucius. Han-Fei-tzŭ, who lived in the third century B.C., says the two most famous schools of philosophy in his day were those of Confucius and Mo-tzŭ,[1] and the *Lü Shih Ch'un Ch'iu*,[2] an important work compiled in the middle of the same century for Lü Pu-wei,[3] says the followers of Confucius and of Mo Ti were in every part of the empire,[4] while Mencius, in the fourth century B.C., says 'the words of Yang Chu and Mo Tî fill the country. If you listen to people's discourses throughout it, you will find that they have adopted the views either of Yang or of Mo.'[5] It was alarm at the spread of these two doctrines, indeed, both of which he regarded as heretical and dangerous, that moved Mencius to expound and defend the principles of Confucius. Yet despite their prevalence at that time they early fell into neglect,[6]

[1] This is the opening sentence of chapter I of *Han-Fei-tzŭ*. The English translation of W. K. Liao, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzŭ*, has only reached chapter xxx. I am indebted to Dr. H. R. Williamson for the loan of a Chinese text of this work, and also for the loan of Forke's *Mê Ti* and Tomkinson's *Social Teachings of Meh Tse*. I may take this opportunity of acknowledging that it was the hearing of Dr. Williamson's lecture on Mo Ti, delivered in Tsinanfu in 1926 and published the following year, which first aroused my interest in Mo-tzŭ.

[2] This has been translated into German by R. Wilhelm, *Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We*, 1928. I am again indebted to Dr. H. R. Williamson for the loan of a copy of the Chinese text.

[3] For an account of the life of Lü Pu-wei, cf. D. Bodde, *Statesman, Patriot and General in Ancient China*, 1940, pp. 1-22.

[4] Cf. *Lü Shih Ch'un Ch'iu*, II, iv: 'The followers of Confucius and Mo-tzŭ, whose fame and influence are felt by all men everywhere, are innumerable.' Cf. also XXV, iii. For German translation, cf. Wilhelm, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 437.

[5] *Mencius* III, Part II, ix. 9—translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., p. 282. Cf. Couvreur, *Les Quatre Livres*, 2nd ed., 1910, p. 453. Both of these editions contain the Chinese text. R. Wilhelm, *Mong Dsi*, 1921, p. 70, gives a German translation without the Chinese text, closely agreeing with Legge. L. A. Lyall, *Mencius*, 1932, p. 96, gives the not very lucid rendering: 'The words of Yang Chu and Mo Ti fill all below heaven. The words of all below heaven come home to Mo, if they do not come home to Yang.' To render *kuei* by *come home* in this context is less satisfactory than to give it its idiomatic as well as literal equivalent *go back to*.

[6] Wang Ch'ung in the first century of our era tells us that the teaching of Mo-tzŭ had already fallen into neglect (cf. A. Forke's translation of Wang Ch'ung's *Lun Hêng*, i, 1907, p. 461).

and for some two thousand years the writings in which Mo-tzŭ's teachings are set forth appear to have been preserved, in so far as they have been preserved, by the Taoists, whose interest was in a small amount of alchemy which they contained, and who preserved the whole for the sake of this.[1] With the edition of Mo-tzŭ's works by Pi Yüan, Governor of Shensi, in 1783, an important step was taken in the rescue of the sage from neglect, and Forke observes that with this event there began a new era in the study of Mo-tzŭ.[2] Further important work was done by Sun I-Jang, who published a critical edition in 1894.[3] Neither of these editions has been accessible to me. Nor have I been able to use the more recent expositions of Mo-tzŭ that have appeared in Chinese,[4] of which there have been a considerable number.[5] The only edition of the Chinese text of Mo-tzŭ to which I have had access is that edited by Chang Shun-i, and published in Shanghai in 1936. The present study has therefore been based mainly on the European studies to which reference has been made.

The long neglect that Mo-tzŭ suffered may seem the more surprising when we recall some of the things that modern students have said about him. His teachings have been described as socialism,[6] and he has been hailed as an anticipator of Rousseau's 'social contract' theory of the state.[7] He has been described as a forerunner of John Stuart Mill in his utilitarianism.[8] As a logician he is thought to have anticipated Aristotle, who has been regarded as the Father of Logic,[9] while as a moral and political

[1] Cf. Williamson, *Mo Ti*, pp. 9 f.

[2] Cf. *Mê Ti*, p. 8.

[3] Other Chinese editions are recorded by Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-11.

[4] Forke lists a number of Chinese and Japanese writers who have written on the teachings of Mo-tzŭ, and some supplementary titles are given by Mei, *Motse, Rival of Confucius*, p. 203.

[5] Tomkinson (*Chinese Recorder*, lxvii, 1936, p. 286) observes that there had been a noticeable fall in Mo-tzŭ's stock in China, and ascribed it to a recrudescence of militarism.

[6] Cf. the titles of the works by E. Faber, Cognetti de Martiis and Alexandra David, noted above.

[7] Cf. F. T. Cheng, *op. cit.*, p. 114. So, too, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (cf. Mei, *op. cit.*, and Tomkinson, *Social Teachings of Meh Tse*, p. 14).

[8] Cf. *Encyclopaedia Sinica*, p. 383b: 'His chief doctrine is Utilitarianism of the kind associated with John Stuart Mill.'

[9] Cf. Williamson, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 f.

teacher he has been declared infinitely superior to the greatest of the Greeks.[1] The severity of his life has earned for him the name of Puritan,[2] and he has frequently been called a pacifist. While this is certainly going too far, his strong opposition to all aggressive war has made him appear singularly modern.[3] As one who gave his ideas on this subject practical expression, and who harnessed his scientific knowledge to the service of his ideas, he may be said to have anticipated Archimedes.[4] Finally, as an exponent of the principle of universal love, he has seemed a forerunner of Christ,[5] and one writer has declared that apart from his political teaching, the doctrine of Mo-tzŭ could be described as the twin sister of Christianity,[6] while another has said that he is the only Chinese who can be said to have founded a religion.[7]

So many-sided and versatile a person might have been expected to live in the memories of his fellow-countrymen, rather than to have been known for many centuries only from the brief attacks on him in the writings of better known sages. Many reasons for his eclipse have been suggested. Arthur Waley attributes his neglect to the style in which his teachings are written. He says : [8]

[1] Cf. de Harlez, *loc. cit.*, viii, 1894, p. 103.

[2] Cf. Mei, *op, cit.*, p. 140 ; Cheng, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

[3] Cf. Cheng, *op. cit.*, pp. 110 f. : ' It is remarkable that at a time distant from the present by nearly twenty-five centuries, he should have forestalled the Kellogg Pact.'

[4] By his mechanical skill Archimedes successfully delivered Syracuse from its siege, while Mo-tzŭ, as will be seen below, was able to prevent an attack by his resource in invention.

[5] Cf. Faber, *op. cit.*, p. 27. Williamson (*op. cit.*, p. 38) quotes Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's description of him as ' a big Marx and a little Christ '. Cf. Liang's *Chinese Political Thought*, p. 110 : ' he evolved a religious system very similar to Christianity '. Other writers, however, dispute this similarity. Edkins (*loc. cit.*, p. 167) observes that ' his views, while resembling Christianity in form, are much more akin in reality to the opinions of Bentham and Paley, who, had he lived in their day, would doubtless have claimed him as an ally '. Cf. Cognetti de Martiis (*loc. cit.*, p. 261) : ' Tuttavia, malgrado la identità estrinseca della formola de Mih con l'evangelica, non v'ha identità intrinseca. La lèttere è in entrambe la medesima, ma lo spirito è diverso.'

[6] Cf. Hoang Tsen-yue, *op. cit.*, p. 143 : ' La doctrine de Mo tseu, sauf la politique, a tant de ressemblance avec celle du Christianisme que l'on peut les prendre comme deux sœurs jumelles.'

[7] Cf. Hu Shih, *Development of the Logical Method*, p. 57. Cf. Wilhelm, *Die chinesischen Literatur*, p. 57.

[8] Cf. *Three Ways of Thought*, pp. 163 f.

'The *Analects* of Confucius are forcible and pointed; at times they even rise to a sort of austere beauty. *Mencius* contains some of the subtlest and most vivid passages in Chinese literature. The *Tao Tê Ching*, most frequently translated of all Chinese books, is an occultist kaleidoscope, a magic void that the reader can fill with what images he will; *Chuang Tzu* is one of the most entertaining as well as one of the profoundest books in the world. Whereas Mo-tzŭ is feeble, repetitive, heavy, unimaginative and unentertaining, devoid of a single passage that could possibly be said to have wit, beauty or force ... If Mo-tzŭ is neglected in Europe it is because he expounds his on the whole rather sympathetic doctrines with a singular lack of aesthetic power.' This infelicity of style was noted in China. For Han-Fei-tzŭ already drew attention to it, and thought that it was deliberate. He says:[1] 'The king of Ch'u said to T'ien Chiu, "Mo-tzŭ was a famous teacher, yet though he was all right in himself his style was prolix and loose. Why was this?" He replied: "There was once a noble of Ch'in who married his daughter to the son of the duke of Chin. He requested Chin to provide the deckings and the garments, whereupon he sent seventy beautifully dressed bridesmaids to Chin. The bridegroom fell in love with a bridesmaid and despised the noble's daughter. The noble may be said to have excellently married the maid, but can hardly be said to have excellently married his daughter. There was a man of Ch'u who sold pearls in Chêng. He made a casket of fragrant wood, perfumed with cassia and spices, adorned with pearls and jade, bedecked with roses, and beautified with feathers. A man of Chêng bought his casket but gave him back the pearls. This merchant may be said to have excellently sold the casket, but can hardly be said to have excellently sold pearls. The discussions of the present day all emphasize stylistic and rhetorical qualities, so that men enjoy their elegance and forget their content. Mo-tzŭ's teaching expounded the ways of the ancient kings and discussed the words of the sages. In teaching men had he cultivated lucidity of style, he feared they would have cherished it for its literary worth and would have forgotten its inner truth. For the

[1] *Han-Fei-tzŭ* xxxii. This chapter has not yet appeared in Liao's translation.

sake of the style they would have lost the content, and this would have been like the man of Ch'u selling pearls and the noble of Ch'in marrying his daughter. Therefore was he verbose and obscure."'

It is improbable, however, that this is the cause of the neglect of Mo-tzŭ in either East or West. His neglect in the West has been due to the inaccessibility of his works in European languages until recently, and that in turn rests in part on the long neglect of him in China.[1] His neglect in China, however, can hardly be due to the style in which his teachings have been preserved. For there was a time, as has been said, when his fame spread throughout China, and his teachings had a considerable vogue. Various other causes have been suggested, which may in part have contributed to his eclipse. Hu Shih suggests that his utilitarianism acted as a boomerang and brought about its own downfall,[2] since its doctrines of universal love and anti-militarism were incompatible with the needs of the age. Tomkinson, on the other hand, cites the view that with the passing of the feudal aristocracy of the period of the Warring States, the *raison d'être* of Moism was gone, and hence it no longer survived.[3] The same writer makes an alternative suggestion, that the main doctrines of Moism were incorporated into rival systems, and notably the pacifism of Mo-tzŭ was taken into the teaching of Mencius and thus into Confucianism, and hence the separate existence of Moism was now superfluous.[4] On the other hand de Harlez thought that it was the bitter hostility of Mencius to the teachings of Mo-tzŭ which effectively terminated its influence.[5] But Moism continued to flourish for some time after Mencius, and neither this nor any of these suggestions is very convincing.

[1] This is, indeed, recognized by Waley, who says (*op. cit.*, p. 164): 'Of course part of the obscurity of Mo-tzŭ in the West is due to the fact that he was till recently very little studied in China.'

[2] *Development of Logical Method*, pp. 61 f.

[3] Cf. *Chinese Recorder*, lxvii, 1936, p. 294.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 296.

[5] Cf. *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, viii, 1894, p. 103: 'L'oubli complet dans lequel il est resté, bien plus cette espèce de reprobation dont il a été frappé dans sa patrie, sont dus aux anathèmes prononcées contre lui par Meng-tze.'

It is possible that the divisions that broke out amongst the followers of Mo-tzŭ in the century after his death may have had some effect on its fortunes and helped to bring about its eclipse. For Mo-tzŭ organized his followers under a head who has been likened to the Roman Pope. He himself was doubtless the first holder of this office, to which the title of Chü-tzŭ was attached, and within thirty years of his death he was succeeded by Mêng Shêng, T'ien-Hsiang-tzŭ and Fu Tun. It has been suggested that the holders of this office formed a sort of 'Suicides' Club'.[1] Before the end of the fourth century B.C. there were three sectional heads, under the Chü-tzŭ, each in charge of a geographical area, and all quarrelling among themselves and scheming for the succession to the chief office. Han-Fei-tzŭ says:[2] 'After the death of Mo-tzŭ there was the Moist school of Hsiang Li, the Moist school of Hsiang Fu, and the Moist school of Têng Ling. Hence, after the time of Confucius and Mo-tzŭ, Confucianism split into eight schools and Moism into three, disagreeing in what they accept and reject, and each claiming to be the true school.' The differences within Moism seem to have been more acute than those within Confucianism, perhaps in part because of the organization of the former, and the personal ambitions that accentuated the differences. From Chuang-tzŭ, the great exponent of Taoism, we learn of these ambitions. He says:[3] 'The followers of Hsiang Li Ch'in such as Wu Hou and the Moists of the South such as K'u Huo, Chi Tz'u and Teng Ling, all recite the same scriptures of Moism but interpret them differently, calling each other heretics of Moism. They criticize one another for their notions of solidity, whiteness, similarity, and dissimilarity; they argue with one another about the contradiction or non-contradiction between the odd and the even. All, however, regard the Elder

[1] Cf. Tomkinson, *loc. cit.*, p. 292.

[2] Cf. *Han-Fei-tzŭ* l. This chapter is not included in Liao's translation yet. The Chinese text of this passage, which stands near the beginning of the chapter, is quoted in Forke, *Mê Ti*, p. 75.

[3] *Chuang-tzŭ*, xxxiii. The above rendering is that of Y. P. Mei (*op. cit.*, p. 167). Cf. the renderings of Legge (*Sacred Books of the East*, xl, 1891, pp. 220 f.), and Giles (*Chuang Tzu: Mystic, Moralist and Social Reformer*, 1926, pp. 442 f.). The Chinese text with French translation is given in Wieger, *Taoïsme*, ii, 1913, pp. 500 f., while Forke gives the Chinese text of part of the passage (*op. cit.*, p. 75).

Master [1] as the Wise Man, aspiring to be his medium in order to become his successor. They cannot come to an agreement even at this time.' This would suggest that even Mo-tzŭ's own professed followers were more concerned with trifling academic disputes than with the great principles which Mo-tzŭ proclaimed. It could hardly be expected therefore, that they would commend his principles to their contemporaries.

Other important suggestions to explain the failure of Moism are made by Granet and Waley. The former thinks that its excessive challenge of the strongly rooted family tradition of China militated against its success,[2] while the latter thinks its psychological weakness, in failing to understand the complexity of the human heart, was a serious weakness.[3] While there may be a measure of truth in these suggestions, they do not explain why it was that Moism once had the hold in China it is said to have had, and then lost it. This still remains obscure, and the total eclipse of this once influential teaching until its revival in modern times remains an unexplained fact.

Because of this long neglect, little is known of Mo-tzŭ's life. Some of the few facts and incidents mentioned in the records will be noted below in the account of his teachings.[4] Here it may be noted that Ssŭ-Ma Ch'ien, the father of Chinese history, devotes but twenty-four words to him in the course of his great work, though there is a further reference in the Preface, to which we shall return. The twenty-four words say: 'Mo Ti was a great officer in the state of Sung. He was skilful in military defence

[1] I.e. Chü-tzŭ, the head of the Moists. Giles (*loc. cit.*) treats this as a proper name here—'Chü Tzŭ was their Sage, and they wanted to canonise him as a saint, that they might carry on his doctrines in after ages'—and Forke (*op. cit.*, pp. 75 f.) says that this is following Kao Yu, who takes this erroneous view. Legge failed to understand the title, and rendered: 'They regarded their most distinguished member as a sage, and wished to make him their chief, hoping that he would be handed down to future ages' (*loc. cit.*).

[2] Cf. *La pensée chinoise*, p. 500.

[3] Cf. *Three Ways of Thought*, pp. 180 f.

[4] It may interest the curious to know that Mo-tzŭ is credited with the invention of the kite. Huai-Nan-tzŭ says that he made a wooden kite which he flew for three days without its coming down (cf. de Groot, *loc. cit.*, p. 665). The same story is referred to by Wang Ch'ung (cf. *Lun Hêng*, translated by A. Forke, i, 1907, pp. 498 f., ii, 1911, p. 353).

and taught economy. Some say that he was contemporary with Confucius, others that he was after him.' [1] That he lived after Confucius is now generally agreed, while it is certain that he lived before Mencius. His life fell therefore within the century 480-380 B.C., though more exact agreement cannot be secured.[2] At that time China was under the nominal rule of an emperor of the Chou dynasty whose power was slight, and the rulers of the separate states into which the land was divided [3] were for all practical purposes independent rulers, giving no more than nominal allegiance to the emperor and warring amongst themselves. The period is therefore known as the age of the Warring States. The more powerful princes plundered the states of the weaker, and the miseries of the common people, who were called to shed their blood in these useless wars, and to see their homes destroyed and plundered, were intense. On the other hand, luxury and extravagance flourished at the courts of the more powerful princes and there were great extremes of poverty and wealth. The evils of the time are reflected in the writings of Mencius no less than in the work of Mo-tzŭ. In Mencius we find : [4] ' Now

[1] The section of Ssŭ-Ma Ch'ien in which this passage stands is not included in the translation of Chavannes, *Les memoires historiques de Se-ma-Ts'ien*, 5 vols., 1895-1905. The twenty-four characters are quoted by Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

[2] Wieger says he probably died before 400 B.C. (*Histoire des Croyances*, p. 207 = E.T., p. 207) ; Hu Shih (*Development of Logical Method*, p. 56) dates him from 500 to 420 B.C. ; Wilhelm (*Die chinesischen Literatur*, p. 57) from 500-490 B.C. to 425-415 ; Z. L. Yih (*Hirth Anniversary Volume*, p. 613) ' somewhere between 500-416 B.C.' ; Forke (*Mê Ti*, p. 27 ; cf. *Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie*, p. 369) assigns him to the period 480-400 B.C. ; Ch'ien Mu (cf. Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 76) to the period 479-381 B.C. ; Sun I-jang (cf. Fung, *ibid.*) to 468-376 B.C. ; Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (cf. Mei, *Motse, Rival of Confucius*, p. 31) reaches the conclusion that his life ran from 466-459 B.C. to 390-382 B.C. ; while Y. P. Mei (*op. cit.*, pp. 31 ff.) ' for convenience of memory ' uses the dates 470-391 B.C. Hoang Tsen-yue does not define the date of his birth, but concludes that he died somewhere between 392 and 382 B.C. C. de Harlez (*Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, viii, 1894, p. 104) assigns him to the period between the last years of the fifth century and the last quarter of the fourth century, but this must surely be a century later than de Harlez really meant, or else ' last ' must stand for ' first '.

[3] It should be remembered that the southern and western parts of what is China to-day consisted then of barbarian tribes outside the Chinese empire.

[4] *Mencius* I, Part II, iv. 6 (translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., pp. 159 f.). Cf. Couvreur, *Les Quatre Livres*, p. 333 ; Lyall, *Mencius*, p. 22. Wilhelm (*Mong Dsi*, p. 15) omits this from his translation, as he holds it to be an interpolation.

the state of things is different. A host marches in attendance on the ruler, and stores of provisions are consumed. The hungry are deprived of their food, and there is no rest for those who are called to toil. Maledictions are uttered by one to another with eyes askance, and the people proceed to the commission of wickedness. Thus the royal ordinances are violated, and the people are oppressed, and the supplies of food and drink flow away like water. The rulers yield themselves to the current, or they urge their way against it ; they are wild ; they are utterly lost :—these things proceed to the grief of the inferior princes.'

Some have supposed that Mo-tzŭ belonged to the state of Sung, which fell within what is now known as Honan. This may be because of Ssŭ-Ma Ch'ien's reference to his official position there. It is generally held to be more probable that he was a native of the state of Lu, which comprised an area in the western part of the modern Shantung.[1] In that case he belonged to the same state as Confucius. It is not even certain that we know his name.[2] For Mo is a very uncommon surname, and various suggestions have been made as to how he came to be known by it. One is that he lived for a time at a place called Mo near to Tsingtao, and later adopted this name,[3] while another is that it was a term of contempt bestowed upon him by others. In ancient China the punishment of branding and reduction to slavery was denoted by the term *mo*, and it is suggested that it was because of the austere frugality advocated by Mo-tzŭ that this term was used in contempt.[4] In his Preface Ssŭ-Ma Ch'ien says : ' Mo-tzu lived in a small house built of rough unworked timbers, with a thatched roof. He used none but earthenware utensils, and partook of the coarsest food. His clothing was of the simplest, of skin or grass according to the season. He was buried in a plain coffin of thin boards.' [5]

Whether Mo-tzŭ was ever an official of Sung, as Ssŭ-Ma

[1] Cf. Y. L. Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 77 ; Forke, *Mê Ti*, p. 29.

[2] Cf. Fung, *op. cit.*, pp. 79 f.

[3] Cf. Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[4] Cf. Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

[5] Translation quoted from Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 3. This passage is not included in Chavannes' translation, and I have not had access to the Chinese text of the *Shih Chi* of Ssŭ-Ma Ch'ien.

Ch'ien states, is much disputed by modern scholars,[1] but Fung Yu-lan thinks [2] his teaching is best explained if he were a native of Lu, who first came under the influence of Confucian teachings, and later became an official of Sung, where he adopted some of the Sung ideas and ideals, which have been found to be much akin to his teaching. This view would scarcely seem to require that he became an official of Sung. That he visited Sung is generally agreed, and a visit, especially if it were a long one, could as well bring him into contact with Sung thought as an official position. That Mo-tzŭ was first a Confucianist is stated by Huai-Nan-tzŭ, who says: [3] 'Mo-tzŭ studied the profession of the Confucianists and received the arts of Confucius. But he considered that the rites [of the Confucian school] were troublesome and displeasing, its stress on elaborate funerals was wealth-consuming and impoverished the people, and its practice of lengthy mourning periods was injurious to the living and harmful to human affairs. Thereupon he turned his back on the Chou dynasty practices and made use of the methods of government of the Hsia dynasty'.

The collection of writings which bears Mo-tzŭ's name did not all come from his pen, though it is probable that it gives a reliable summary of his teachings.[4] The surviving chapters are distributed amongst fifteen books, and this agrees with the oldest information we have. There have, however, been some losses from these books. For they once contained seventy-one chapters, and at a later date sixty-one, while to-day no more that fifty-three are extant. These have all been included in Forke's German translation, but the English rendering of Y. P. Mei omits what he describes as the chapters on Logic and Defence, and Tomkinson's omits certain other chapters in addition. By the chapters on Logic Mei means six chapters contained in Books X and XI, sometimes referred to as *Mo Pien*, or Mo-tzŭ's Discussions.

[1] Cf. Forke, *Mê Ti*, p. 30; Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 3; Tomkinson, *Social Teachings of Meh Tse*, p. 6.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 78. Cf. Mei, *Motse, Rival of Confucius*, p. 45; Wilhelm, *Die chinesischen Literatur*, p. 57.

[3] Translation of D. Bodde in Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 77, where the passage is quoted. It is also translated by Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 42. Cf. Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[4] Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 ff.; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 ff.

The first two of these are Ching, or Canon, and are the most difficult to interpret of all the chapters.[1] The other four chapters are commentary and appendix, or illustrations. Hu Shih holds that these have nothing to do with Mo-tzŭ, but contain the work of a later distinct school of scientific and logical Neo-Moists.[2] Others attribute the first two chapters to Mo-tzŭ himself, the commentary to a disciple—possibly Têng Ling—and the remaining two chapters to later hands,[3] while Tomkinson observes that 'it still seems possible, on the evidence available, to regard these chapters as the work of Meh Tse himself or of his earliest disciples, and not necessarily as produced by the Sophists of a considerably later age'.[4]

The chapters on Defence comprise the last eleven surviving chapters, and these again are full of technical terms and very hard to understand or to translate.[5] Preceding them is a chapter which Mei and Tomkinson translate, and which is believed to have been an introduction to these chapters.[6] It contains an account of an interview of Mo-tzŭ with an official of the state of Ch'u, who gives his name to the chapter, Kung Shu. At some of the contents of this chapter we shall have occasion later to look.

Of far greater importance and interest are the chapters known as the Synoptic Chapters. This is because they survive in three versions—or in some cases one or two, though probably there were originally three—and it has been surmised that these were the forms accepted by the rival schools above referred to.[7] This is speculative and doubtful, and is hardly supported by the above cited passage which tells of these divisions. For it declares that

[1] Mei observes that Forke's rendering of these chapters not infrequently misses the meaning of the original (*Motse, Rival of Confucius*, p. 57).

[2] Cf. *Development of Logical Method*, pp. 59 f. Hu Shih refers to these chapters as 'Books 32-37'. They are numbered as chapters xl-xlv in the translations of Forke and Mei, and in the Chinese text to which I have had access.

[3] Cf. Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[4] Cf. *Chinese Recorder*, lxvii, 1936, p. 291.

[5] Tomkinson (*The Social Teachings of Meh Tse*, p. 18) says no one has seriously attributed these chapters to Mo-tzŭ, and there is an old but doubtful tradition that they are the work of Ch'in Hua-li, an early disciple.

[6] Cf. Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 12. Tomkinson and Mei, however, connect this chapter rather with the four chapters of 'Mo-tzŭ Analects' noted below.

[7] Cf. Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 54; Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

the various groups all cherished the same scriptures, but quarrelled about their interpretation. Tomkinson says that 'the general trend of opinion amongst scholars seems to be that the versions are the work of three disciples, or three groups of disciples, not, however, the three groups mentioned by Han Fei Tse'.[1] He himself prefers to think that they all come from Mo-tzŭ's own hand, and represent his treatment of the subjects at different periods of his life. It is in these chapters that we have the main teachings of Mo-tzŭ set forth. They deal with :

1. the Exaltation of the Virtuous (*shang hsien*) ;
2. the Promotion of Unity (*shang t'ung*) ;
3. Universal Love (*chien ai*) ;
4. Against Aggressive War (*fei kung*) ;
5. Economy of Expenditure (*chieh yung*) ;
6. Economy in Funeral Rites (*chieh tsang*) ;
7. the Will of Heaven (*T'ien chih*) ;
8. the Existence of Spirits (*ming kuei*) ;
9. Against Music (*fei yo*) ;
10. Against Fatalism (*fei ming*) ;
11. Against Confucianism (*fei ju*).

Of the thirty-two chapters originally devoted to these subjects twenty-four are extant, two only on Economy of Expenditure having survived, and one each on Economy in Funeral Rites, the Existence of Spirits, Against Music, and Against Confucianism. It would appear that there were never more than two versions of the last. Not all of these chapters are accepted as authentic, and Tomkinson relegates the chapters Against Music, and Against Confucianism to the category of the questionably authentic.[2] In the latter case doubt is especially widely shared.

Four other chapters form an important group, rather after the style of the Confucian *Analects*. These contain memories of Mo-tzŭ and accounts of incidents in his life and illustrations of his methods of teaching. They are held to be generally reliable. The titles of three of them give little indication of their contents, while the fourth has something of the flavour of Amos about its title. These chapters are called :

[1] Cf. *The Social Teachings of Meh Tse*, p. 21. [2] Cf. Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

1. Kêng Chu (a proper name);
2. the Importance of Righteousness (*ḳuei i*);
3. Kung Mêng (a proper name);
4. the Inquiry of Lu (i.e. of the ruler of Lu).

The remaining seven chapters stand first in the collection, but these are regarded as of questionable authenticity or spurious. They are all included in Mei's translation, and the last four of them, which are less firmly rejected and which are more closely related to Mo-tzŭ's principal teachings, are included in Tomkinson's translation. It will be seen, therefore, that in general we should rely on the Synoptic Chapters and the Mo-tzŭ 'Analects' for the study of the sage's teaching. It is here that his characteristic ideas are expounded.

Of his logic little can here be said.[1] He was impatient of shallow thought that played with words. In the chapter Kung Mêng we read: 'Mo-tzŭ asked a Confucianist, saying: "What is the purpose of Music?" He replied: "Music is for music's sake."[2] Mo-tzŭ answered: "You have not yet answered my question. If I were to ask what is the purpose of a house, and you replied that it was to give protection against the cold in winter and against the heat in summer, and to separate men from women, you would have given me the reason for building a house. But when I ask what is the purpose of music and you answer that music is for music's sake, it is like answering the question what a house is for by saying 'A house is built for the sake of a house.'"'[3]

A more penetrating observation is contained in Mo-tzŭ's comment on a saying of Confucius'. We read: 'Tzŭ Kao, the

[1] Cf. Hu Shih, *Development of Logical Method*, pp. 63 ff., and H. Maspero, 'Notes sur la logique de Mo-tseu et de son école', in *T'oung Pao*, xxv, 1928, pp. 1-64.

[2] Hu Shih (*op. cit.*, p. 65) renders here 'Music is an amusement', giving to the repeated character two different senses and relieving the tautology. The word can, indeed, have the second sense, and in the opening chapter of the Confucian *Analects* it has that sense, where Legge (*The Chinese Classics*, i, 2nd ed., 1893, p. 137) renders 'Is it not *delightful* to have friends coming from distant quarters?' It is likely that the second sense was in the mind of the Confucianist, so that we have a pun (cf. Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 86), but it is clear from the reply that Mo-tzŭ understood it to be completely tautologous. Cf. Forke, *Mê Ti*, p. 570 n.

[3] *Mo-Tzŭ* xlviii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 570; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 139 f. Mei, *The Ethical and Political Works of Motse*, p. 237.

Duke of Shê, asked Chung Ni [1] about government, saying: "What is the good governor like?" Chung Ni replied: "The good governor draws near those who are afar, and reforms what is obsolete." [2] When Mo-tzŭ heard this, he observed: "Tzŭ Kao, the Duke of Shê, did not put his question right, nor did Chung Ni give a correct reply. For how could Tzŭ Kao, the Duke of Shê, fail to know that the good governor draws near those who are afar, and reforms what is obsolete? What he wished to know was how to effect this. The answer did not tell him what he did not know, but only what he already knew." [3] Here, as throughout Mo-tzŭ's teaching, we find a practical application of his logical faculties. He is never content to think he has solved a problem when he has given a name to it, and empty words have no meaning for him. He said: 'Teaching that can be expressed in deeds may be constantly given; what cannot be given effect should not be constantly taught. When what cannot be given effect is constantly taught, we have but idle words.' [4]

His appeal is constantly to the reason. This is well illustrated by his condemnation of aggressive war. 'To kill one man is said to be criminal and to merit the death penalty. To kill ten men then is tenfold criminal and merits the death penalty tenfold. To kill a hundred men is a hundredfold criminal and merits the death penalty a hundredfold. All the gentlemen of the world know this, and pronounce these things to be criminal. Yet when we come to the greatest crime, the attacking of a state, they do not know that they should condemn it, but on the contrary applaud it and pronounce it righteous. . . . If there were a man who on seeing a little blackness said it was black, but on seeing a lot of blackness said it was white, we should certainly consider that he

[1] I.e. Confucius.

[2] This saying of Confucius' is not preserved in quite this form in the Confucian *Analects*, where we find: 'The Duke of Sheh asked about government. The Master said, "Good government obtains, when those who are near are made happy, and those who are far off are attracted"' (*Analects* XIII xvi, translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, i, 2nd ed., p. 269; cf. Couvreur, *Les Quatre Livres*, p. 216).

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xlvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 542 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 126; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

[4] *Mo-tzŭ* xlvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 544; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 126; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 217. This saying is repeated in chap. xlvii.

was unable to distinguish between white and black. If he were to taste a little bitterness and pronounce it bitter but on tasting a lot of bitterness should pronounce it sweet, we should certainly say that he was unable to distinguish between sweet and bitter. So they who reckon a small crime to be worthy of condemnation, but who do not condemn the greatest crime, even the attacking of a state, but on the contrary applaud it and pronounce it righteous, may be said to be incapable of distinguishing between right and wrong.' [1]

Mo-tzŭ's opposition to the wanton aggression that led to the innumerable wars of his day was fundamental, and it dictated one of the principal elements of his teaching. He stressed the point just illustrated that it failed to apply on the grand scale standards universally recognized on the small. 'The gentlemen of the world recognize trifles but not great things', he said. 'If a man steals a dog or a pig, he is held to commit a sin against humanity; if he steals a state or a city, this is held to be righteous.' [2] The same thing is said by Chuang-tzŭ, but with nothing of the moral earnestness of Mo-tzŭ. For Chuang-tzŭ spoke as a satirist rather than as a reformer when he observed: 'One man steals a purse and is punished; another steals a state and becomes a Prince.' [3] But Mo-tzŭ was less the keen observer than the prophet of reform. He not alone denounced the criminality of war, but also its futility. 'When great states attack small states', he said, 'it is like children playing at horses. Children playing at horses only tire and weary themselves. When a great state attacks a small one, the farmers of the state attacked cannot attend to their ploughing and the womenfolk cannot attend to their weaving, since all are engaged on defence. Similarly the farmers of the attacking state cannot attend to their ploughing and the womenfolk cannot attend to their weaving, since all are

[1] *Mo-tzŭ* xvii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 267 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 60 ff.; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 99 f. The whole of this chapter is quoted in Hu Shih, *Development of Logical Method*, pp. 69 ff.

[2] *Mo-tzŭ* xlix. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 582; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 147; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 246.

[3] *Chuang-tzŭ* x, translation of Giles, *Chuang Tzu*, 1926, p. 114. Cf. Legge, *Sacred Books of the East*, xxxix, 1891, p. 285. The Chinese text with French translation is found in Wieger, *Taoïsme*, ii, 1913, pp. 278 f.

engaged on attack. Hence, when great states attack small states, it is like children playing at horses.' [1]

This appeal to utilitarian motives was also characteristic of Mo-tzŭ. But he went far beyond this and stripped off the veneer of glory that successful wars were thought to bring, and exposed the hollow nature of so many of the victories. For he held that aggression brought nemesis, which the victory of to-day is powerless to avert. When the state of Ch'i was going to attack its neighbour Lu, Mo-tzŭ pointed his criticism by saying: 'Formerly the king of Wu attacked Yüeh in the east and drove his people to Kuei Chi for refuge. In the west he attacked Ch'u and shut up King Chao in Sui. In the north he attacked Ch'i and took the Crown Prince [2] prisoner to Wu. Then the nobles exacted vengeance, and his own people were wretched and exhausted and refused to serve him, so that the state came to disaster, and the king himself was executed.' [3]

He knew how to prick the bubbles of high motive with which the aggressors sought to disguise their selfish ends. When he sought to dissuade Prince Wên from attacking the state of Chêng, he was asked 'Why should you, sir, prevent me from attacking Chêng? For three generations have the people of Chêng slain their ruler.[4] Heaven has visited them with punishment and caused the harvest to fail for three years. I am only helping Heaven to punish them.' To this Mo-tzŭ replied: 'Suppose there were a man whose son was bad tempered and good for nothing, so that his father thrashed him. If his neighbour's father took up a cudgel and struck him, and said "I am only striking him in accordance with his father's will", would not this be very foolish?' [5]

[1] *Mo-tzŭ* xlvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 543 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 126; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 216 f.

[2] This rendering follows Forke, taking the characters *kuo tzŭ* to mean 'state son', i.e. Crown Prince. Alternatively they are taken to refer to Kuo Shu, who was a general of Ch'i.

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xlix. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 579; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 144; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 242 f.

[4] Literally, *father*. Tomkinson understands it to mean that three generations of rulers had slain their fathers.

[5] *Mo-tzŭ* xlix. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 581 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 145; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 245 f.

Nor did he rely on moral suasion alone. He employed his inventive wit to devise measures of defence. For Mo-tzŭ was not a pacifist, who refused to countenance any form of warfare. He opposed aggressive war, but found no wrong in defence against attack, and on one occasion, on hearing that the state of Ch'u was about to attack Sung, he travelled to Ch'u to avert this attack. His appeals at first fell on deaf ears. The ruler of Ch'u relied on some new invention, called ' cloud ladders ' against which he thought there was no defence, and so proposed to reap an easy and certain victory. Getting nowhere with the prince, Mo-tzŭ turned to the inventor of the ' cloud-ladders ', Kung Shu Pan, and taking his girdle to represent the city wall and a writing tablet to represent military equipment, he challenged the inventor to capture the city. Nine times Kung Shu Pan employed his strategy and as many times Mo-tzŭ foiled his attack, leaving Kung Shu Pan at a loss for a plan and Mo-tzŭ still with defensive plans in reserve. Then an ugly thought crossed Kung Shu Pan's mind. ' I know how I can get the better of you ', he said, ' though I prefer not to say.' ' I know what you have in mind ', replied Mo-tzŭ, ' but neither will I say.' The ruler now inquired what this plan was, and Mo-tzŭ replied: ' Kung Shu Pan's idea is just to have me murdered. He thinks that when I am dead, Sung will be helpless in defence, and he can then attack it. But my disciples, Ch'in Hua-li and others, to the number of three hundred, are already armed with my implements of defence and manning the walls of Sung, awaiting the brigands of Ch'u. Even though I be murdered, you will still not cut off my defence.' The ruler of Ch'u thereupon decided to call off the projected attack.[1]

In this story we have an illustration of the principle of universal love which Mo-tzŭ both advocated and practised, and which was his cardinal heresy in the eyes of his critics. He was not actuated by patriotism, since Sung was not his own state, but simply by the love of men and by his firm anti-aggressive principles. For Mo-tzŭ held that the ills of society sprang from partiality and discrimination, and that a world in which all loved all equally would be an ideal world. He said: ' If we could

[1] *Mo-tzŭ* l. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 597 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 154 f.; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 258 f.

cause all men to feel a universal mutual love (*chien hsiang ai*) so that every man loved all others as himself, would there be anyone unfilial? If they loved father, elder brother and prince as themselves, they would hate to display unfilial feeling. . . . Would there be any thieves or robbers? When men regarded the houses of others as their own, who would rob? When they regarded the persons of others as their own, who would steal? Hence thieves and robbers would be no more. Would there be mutual discord among the families of the great and mutual aggression among the states of the princes? When each loved his neighbour's family as his own, who would create discord? When each loved his neighbour's state as his own, who would invade? Therefore mutual discord among the families of the great and mutual aggression among the states of the princes would be no more.' [1]

Or again he said: 'Suppose there are two men, of whom one adopts the principle of making distinctions (*pieh*) and the other adopts the principle of universality (*chien*). The first will say "How can I consider my friend's person as my own, my friend's kin as mine?" Hence, if he sees his friend in hunger, he will not feed him, or if he sees him cold, he will not clothe him; if he finds him sick, he will not minister to him, if dead, he will not bury him. Such is the language, and such the conduct of the advocate of making distinctions. Quite other will be the language and the conduct of the advocate of universality. He will say: "I have heard that he who would be great among men should consider his friend as himself, his friend's kin as his own, for so alone can he be great among men." Hence, if he sees his friend in hunger, he will feed him, or if he sees him cold, will clothe him; if he finds him sick, he will minister to him, if dead, will bury him. Such is the language, and such the conduct of the advocate of universality.' [2]

It is clear from the whole tenour of this passage that Mo-tzŭ would give to the word 'friend' here as wide a connotation as

[1] *Mo-tzŭ* xiv. Cf. Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., p. 102; Alexandra David, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 f.; Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 242 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 49; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 79 f.

[2] *Mo-tzŭ* xvi. Cf. Legge, *op. cit.*, p. 110; David, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 f.; Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 255 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 54 f.; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 89 f.

Jesus did to 'neighbour' in the parable of the Good Samaritan. Of the loftiness and nobility of such teaching there can be no question, and Mei observes that 'it may be regarded as a concrete expression of the Christian Golden Rule'.[1] In his own day Mo-tzŭ was criticized as doctrinaire. He says: 'The gentlemen of the world say: "While it would be a fine thing if love could be universal, it is utterly impracticable. It is like taking up T'ai Shan[2] and leaping over the Huang Ho or the River Chi."'[3] To this Mo-tzŭ replied that the ancient kings had practised his principles, and that therefore they were practicable. Elsewhere we read that he defended himself against the charge that his teaching would not work by saying: 'If it were not practicable, then even I would reject it. Is it possible that anything should be good and yet impracticable?'[4] The criticism of impracticability was renewed by Chuang-tzŭ, who granted that Mo-tzŭ himself could carry out his own teachings, but who doubted if the ordinary man was capable of such heights of conduct.[5] Similarly Wang Ch'ung observed: 'The Confucian doctrine has come down to us, that of Mê Ti has fallen into desuetude, because the Confucian principles can be put in use, while the Mêhist system is very difficult to practise.'[6]

That Mo-tzŭ did in fact put his principles into practice is admitted by all. 'The philosopher Mo loves all equally', said Mencius. 'If by rubbing smooth his whole body from the crown to the heel, he could have benefited the kingdom, he would have done it.'[7] When he journeyed to Ch'u to prevent the attack on Sung, he travelled at great discomfort in his unselfish desire

[1] Cf. *Motse, Rival of Confucius*, p. 92.

[2] A sacred mountain in Shantung, often visited by Confucius.

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xv. Cf. Legge, *op. cit.*, p. 106; David, *op. cit.*, p. 39; Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 248; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 51; Mei, *The Works of Motse*, p. 84.

[4] *Mo-tzŭ* xvi. Cf. Legge, *op. cit.*, p. 110; David, *op. cit.*, p. 45; Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 255; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 89. (Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 54, omits the quoted sentence.)

[5] *Chuang-tzŭ* xxxiii. Cf. Legge, *Sacred Books of the East*, xl, p. 219; Giles, *Chuang Tzu*, p. 441; Wieger, *Taoïsme*, ii, pp. 500 f. (where the Chinese text is also given).

[6] Cf. *Lun Hêng* (translated by Forke), i, p. 461.

[7] *Mencius* VII, Part I, xxvi. 2, translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., pp. 464 f. Cf. Couvreur, *Les Quatre Livres*, p. 620; Wilhelm, *Mong Dsi*, p. 164; Lyall, *Mencius* p. 212.

to avert a needless war. 'The following story' says Hu Shih, 'told in numerous sources, best portrays the spirit of Mohism and the character of its founder. Kung Shu Pan, the State Engineer of Chu, had just completed his new invention of a "cloud ladder" for besieging walled cities, and the King of Chu was planning an invasion into the State of Sung. When Mo Ti learned of this he started out from his native state and travelled ten days and ten nights all on foot, arriving at the capital city with sun-burnt face and battered feet'.[1] This story is found in the *Lü Shih Ch'un Ch'iu*, where it is added that he was forced to tear up his clothes to bandage his blistered feet.[2] Little wonder that Chuang-tzŭ should describe him as 'one of the best men in the world, which you may search without finding his equal. Decayed and worn his person might be, but he is not to be rejected—a scholar of ability indeed.'[3]

It was not because his teaching was thought to be impracticable, however, that it was so bitterly opposed by Mencius and regarded as a serious menace to society. What is impracticable may be trusted not to be practised. But Mencius was seriously afraid that Mo-tzŭ's teaching might be taken seriously. He classed him with Yang Chu as a dangerous heretic. To Christian readers it seems at first sight odd that Yang Chu, who is said by Legge to be 'about "the least erected spirit" who ever professed to reason concerning the life and duties of man',[4] should be classed with Mo-tzŭ, who is so frequently compared with Christ.[5] For Yang Chu advocated only the most naked selfishness, and complete indifference to every interest but one's own.[6] To Mencius,

[1] Cf. *Development of Logical Method*, p. 57.

[2] Cf. *Lü Shih Ch'un Ch'iu*, XXI, v. For German translation cf. Wilhelm, *Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We*, pp. 382 f.

[3] *Chuang-tzŭ* xxxiii, translation of Legge, *Sacred Books of the East*, xl, p. 221 Cf. Giles, *Chuang Tzu*, p. 443; Wieger, *Taoïsme*, ii, pp. 502 f. Cf., too, the rendering given by Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *History of Chinese Political Thought*, p. 105.

[4] Cf. *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., p. 92.

[5] For some account of the teachings of Yang Chu, cf. Legge, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-99; Forke, *Yang Chu's Garden of Pleasure*, 1912; *id.*, *Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie*, pp. 356-367; Fung, *History of Chinese Philosophy*, pp. 133-143; *id.*, *The Spirit of Chinese Philosophy*, 1947, pp. 29-34.

[6] Cf. Krause, *Ju-Tao-Fo*, 1924, p. 87: 'Er ist Sensualist und Epikureer, sein system ein egoistischer Individualismus, der theoretischen Pessimismus und praktische Eudaimonologie vereinigt.'

however, both seemed to menace the foundations of society, though in such different ways. For Yang Chu's pure individualism denied any idea of a duty towards others, while Mo-tzŭ's undiscriminating love ignored the special claims of kindred. 'Yang's principle', said Mencius, 'is "each one for himself", which does not acknowledge the claims of the sovereign. Mo's principle is "to love all equally", which does not acknowledge the peculiar affection due to a father. But to acknowledge neither king nor father is to be in the state of a beast. . . . If the principles of Yang and Mo be not stopped, and the principles of Confucius not set forth, then those perverse speakings will delude the people, and stop up the path of benevolence and righteousness. When benevolence and righteousness are stopped up, beasts will be led on to devour men, and men will devour one another.'[1]

What Mo-tzŭ said, as we have seen, was that universal love would include the love of parent and friend. He was trying to lift the love of all to the same high level that Confucius and Mencius demanded for the nearest and dearest. Yet in denying that there were any with special claim on us he seemed to Mencius to be a peril. For to Mencius the corollary of the principle that my neighbour's parents have as great a claim on me as my own was that my parents have no greater claim on me than my neighbour's. He was, therefore, loosening the special ties of kindred, which belonged to the very foundations of society.[2] Fundamentally the same criticism is made by Hsün-tzŭ, who says: 'Micius has insight about what is universal but not about the individual. . . . If one considers the universal, but not the particular, then the government cannot operate.'[3] The whole essence of the Confucian view of man lay in its balanced estimate of his nature and duty. Extreme selfishness and extreme unselfishness were alike to Mencius in being extremes, and extremes have a tendency to

[1] *Mencius* III, Part II, ix. 3, translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., pp. 282 f. Cf. Couvreur, *Les Quatre Livres*, pp. 453 f.; Wilhelm, *Mong Dsi*, pp. 70 f.; Lyall, *Mencius*, p. 97.

[2] Cf. Wilhelm, *Die chinesischen Literatur*, p. 58: 'Mo Ti mit seiner allgemeinen Liebe kenne keinen Vater, d.h. keinen Familienorganismus.'

[3] *Hsün-tzŭ* xvii, translation of H. Dubs, *The Works of Hsüntze*, 1928, pp. 184 f.

meet. And indeed, as we have seen, they did soon meet in the chief followers of Mo-tzŭ. When his followers split into sections whose leaders were each ambitious to become the Chü-tzŭ, it is hard not to find the principle of selfishness, and ' each one for himself ' at work.

Moreover the teaching of Mo-tzŭ is frequently criticized in that there was in it an appeal to self-interest. For combined with the principle of universal mutual love (*chien hsiang ai*) we find the principle of the mutual conferring of profit (*chiao hsiang li*), and the idealism of Mo-tzŭ is held to become a mere utilitarianism. This was another element in the criticism of Hsün-tzŭ, who flourished a little later than Mencius. He observed that ' if we consider life from the standpoint of utility, it will merely be seeking for profit '.[1] The same complaint has been made by modern writers too.[2] For if unselfishness is pursued because it pays, then its pursuit is rooted in its antithesis. It is true that Mo-tzŭ emphasizes the material benefits that would, he believed, follow the adoption of his principles, and sometimes gave the impression that he was a mere pragmatist. Already we have noted a saying which suggests his belief that the good was the useful. ' Is it possible that anything should be good and yet impracticable ? '[3] And in the *Mo-tzŭ Classic*, or *Canon*, we find ' Righteousness is profit ',[4] which could easily be represented as the view that ' righteousness is merely what pays '. It is only fair to Mo-tzŭ to say that if it is true that mutual love is mutually beneficial, the paradox is in experience and it is but clearsightedness to perceive it and simple truth to enunciate it. In the teaching of the Bible the will of God is the only basis for the well-being of man, and more than one passage describes the incomparable beauty of a world in which that will should be perfectly done. Yet the selfish, who are only concerned for their own well-being, and

[1] Cf. *Hsün-tzŭ* xxi, translation of H. Dubs, *The Works of Hsüntze*, 1928, p. 264.

[2] Cf. Krause, *Ju-Tao-Fo*, 1924, p. 89 : ' Die Menschenliebe ist bei ihm aber nur ein Mittel, um den möglichsten Frieden des eignen Lebens zu geniessen. Das Motiv ist kein rein humanitäres, wie der gleiche Grundsatz in der christlichen Ethik, sondern ein utilitaristisches.'

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xvi.

[4] *Mo-tzŭ* xl (I li yeh). Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 415. This chapter is untranslated by Tomkinson or Mei.

eager to possess that world, can never do the will of God. It should not be forgotten that Mo-tzŭ taught the love of others, whose corollary rather than whose source was mutual good. E. R. Hughes says: 'His utilitarian mind made him construe love in terms of doing good, being useful to your fellow men.'[1] That this is true cannot be gainsaid, and it was probably due in no small measure to the conditions of his time. Christian missionaries have been known in times of famine to spend their time in famine relief, and have not been ashamed of so doing. And if in times of desperate ills Mo-tzŭ was moved with pity for the sufferings of men we need not be surprised or condemn him. He neither preached nor practised a cold, calculating search for profit, but inculcated a self-forgetting love whose profit would only be universal when its practice was universal. Nor did he ever suggest that the individuals who followed him could begin to enter into the dividends at once. The dividends could only accrue when the practice was general, and until then he offered self-sacrifice and suffering rather than profit. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao says: 'Motze's theory does not consider the individual at all. According to him nothing is profitable unless it profits the whole of mankind. To secure this mutual profit it is necessary that all individuals should sacrifice their personal profits.'[2] That Mo-tzŭ sought love for its own sake and not for any profit it could bring him is clear from the fact that it brought him no profit, but only pain, and that he gladly embraced it. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao says again 'if men had nailed him to a cross, he would certainly not have regretted it, but would have endured it with a smile'.[3] It was love that Mo-tzŭ taught, and love that merely seeks its own gain is not love.

The main criticisms launched against him were that his love was too all-embracing, and not that it was too calculating. We read that on one occasion when he was journeying from the state of Lu to the state of Ch'i he met an old friend who said to him: 'Nowadays there is none who practises righteousness; you alone at the cost of suffering practise it. You should give it

[1] Cf. *Chinese Philosophy in Classical Times*, p. 45.
[2] Cf. *Chinese Political Thought*, p. 102.
[3] Quoted in Holth, *Micius*, p. 3.

up.' Whereupon Mo-tzŭ replied: 'There was a man who had ten sons, of whom one worked on the land while the other nine idled. The one who worked on the land, therefore, had to work all the harder. Why? Because there were many to feed and few to cultivate. Nowadays there is none who practises righteousness. You should therefore urge me on. Why should you stop me?'[1] Here is no sordid seeking after profit.

Nor did Mo-tzŭ's first followers seek their own profit. Huai-Nan-tzŭ says he had a bodyguard of a hundred and eighty men, who would willingly go to death by fire or sword at his command,[2] and Chuang-tzŭ assures us that the Ch'in Hua-li, to whom reference has been already made, shared his Master's self-sacrificing spirit. He says: 'The idea of Mo Tî and *Khin* Hwa-lî[3] was good, but their practice was wrong. They would have made the Mohists of future ages feel it necessary to toil themselves, till there was not a hair on their legs, and still be urging one another on.'[4] Moreover, the *Lü Shih Ch'un Ch'iu* narrates the story of the heroic but futile self-sacrifice of Mo-tzŭ's successor as Chü-tzŭ and a hundred and eighty-three of his followers,[5] 'actuated', as Williamson observes,[6] 'by no other motive than fidelity to the principle of defending the oppressed'. Neither Mo-tzŭ nor his immediate followers were under any illusions about quick returns from the practice of love.

There was, indeed, an ascetic strain in his teaching and practice. Hsün-tzŭ complained that 'Mo-tzŭ's one-sided doctrine of utility made him ignore the significance of culture

[1] *Mo-Tzŭ* xlvii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 551; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 130; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

[2] Cf. Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 82, where the passage is translated.

[3] This is merely a different romanization of the name Ch'in Hua-li.

[4] *Chuang-tzu* xxxiii, translation of Legge, *Sacred Books of the East*, xl, p. 221. Cf. Giles, *Chuang-Tzu*, p. 443; Wieger, *Taoïsme*, ii, pp. 500 ff. (where the Chinese text is also given).

[5] Cf. *Lü Shih Ch'un Ch'iu*, XIX, iii. For German translation cf. Wilhelm, *Frühling und Herbst des Lü Bu We*, pp. 327 f. Cf. also Fung, *op. cit.*, p. 83; Williamson, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 f.; Waley, *Three Ways of Thought*, pp. 178 ff. (Fung and Williamson give the number as eighty-three; the Chinese text to which I have had access gives one hundred and eighty-three, and so Wilhelm and Waley.)

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

and refinement '.[1] This was because he advocated the severest economy in public and private expenditure, and especially in the matter of funerals, and opposed music. 'Whatever adds to expense', he said, 'but adds nothing to the profit of the people, the Sage-Kings did not countenance.'[2] Or again, 'To cut out useless expenditure is to walk in the way of the Sage-Kings.'[3] Whether in public or in private expenditure all that is merely ornamental he held to be waste, and advocated the severest economy and austerity. 'What are clothes for?' he asked. 'In winter to keep out the cold, in summer to keep out the heat. The test of good clothing is therefore whether it adds warmth in winter and coolness in summer. What is merely decorative but does not so add should be cut out.'[4] He goes on to illustrate the same principle in regard to houses, boats and vehicles. Only the useful is the good, and all that is merely aesthetic is not useful.

Again it is only fair to see this against the background of his time, with the great social inequalities which faced him on every side. He saw labour that was urgently needed for the necessities of the many being dissipated on the luxuries of the few, and hence saw luxury as the enemy of the well-being of the people. Similarly in the context of idle rich he urged the importance of honest and unremitting toil in a way that would satisfy the most exacting of our modern politicians. 'Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might'[5] would have delighted him as a motto. Everyone, be he statesman, judge or labourer, should not grudge a full day's labour. The rulers should devote themselves from morning till night to the duties of their office, the lesser officials to all the multitudinous tasks of administration, the farmers from the crack of dawn till sundown should toil in the fields with

[1] *Hsün-tzŭ* xxi, translation quoted by Kennedy (*Chinese Recorder*, lxii, 1931, p. 696) without acknowledgement of its source. Dubs, *loc. cit.*, has 'Micius was prejudiced towards utility and did not know the elegancies of life.'

[2] *Mo-tzŭ* xxi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 296; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 75; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xx. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 292; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 73; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

[4] *Mo-tzŭ* xx. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 289; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 71; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

[5] Eccl. ix. 10.

unremitting diligence, and the women should rise betimes to spin and weave, and should continue their tasks till late at night.[1]

All this was probably due to the conditions of the times, and did not mean that Mo-tzŭ thought that all luxury and ornament were wrong *per se*. Fung Yu-lan quotes from Liu Hsiang a story about Mo-tzŭ, which, if true, would show that he did not regard these things as inherently evil, but only relatively so compared with the more urgent needs. The story tells how Mo-tzŭ once in answer to a question said : ' Suppose that in a year of bad times, someone wished to give you the pearl of the Marquis of Sui, yet would not allow you to sell it, but only to keep it as a valuable decoration. Or that he wished to give you a *chung* of grain. If you would get the pearl you would not get the grain, and *vice versa*. Then which would you choose ? ' To which the reply came : ' I would choose the grain, for with this I could rescue myself from my extremity.' Mo-tzŭ replied : ' Truly so. So then why strive after lavishness ? The Sage does not hasten to exalt what is without use and to delight in frivolity and licence. Therefore one's food should always be sufficient before one seeks to have it fine tasting ; one's clothing should always be warm before one tries to make it beautiful ; and one's dwelling should always be safe before one tries to make it pleasure giving. . . . To put what is fundamental first and external decoration secondary : this is what the Sage concerns himself with.' [2] Since this story comes from so late a time as the first century B.C., it cannot be accepted without reserve, though it probably rightly relates Mo-tzŭ's austerity to the rigour of the times, when so many had not the bare necessities of life.

So was it also with his opposition to music. It was because music drew men from their labour that Mo-tzŭ opposed it. It is again only fair to point out that to say Mo-tzŭ was against music gives a false impression to the modern ear. ' It should be remembered ', says Yih, ' that the term " Music " has here a much wider application than that generally understood. The term is applied to engravings, delicious food and beautiful houses. In

[1] *Mo-tzŭ* xxxii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 370 ; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 159 ; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

[2] Cf. Fung, *op. cit.*, pp. 104 f.

fact it means all sorts of luxuries, arts and pleasure-seeking.'[1] Similarly Waley says: 'What Mo-tzu had in mind were elaborate and costly danced rituals, demanding expensive costumes, the maintenance of large companies of dancers and musicians, all of which were paid out of the public funds.'[2] It would be a better translation into modern idiom to say that he was against amusements, and that because they were a form of extravagance, breeding waste and idleness, and leading to selfishness. Nevertheless it remains true that life as Mo-tzŭ conceived it was a dreary business, and there was little millennial quality about the 'mutual conferring of benefits' that he called for. It consisted alone in a life of unceasing toil, without colour or relief, and rewarded by the barest necessities of existence. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao says 'Motze's opposition to music is like a man who builds a house but deplores the space within the walls as waste.'[3]

Similarly Mo-tzŭ's demand for simplicity in funerals was born of his horror at all the waste imposed by the tyranny of funeral customs.[4] He declaims against the customs of his day, with their costly coffins and periods of mourning extending to as much as three years, and declares that the funeral of a nobleman was calculated to empty the treasury of the state, and that of a peasant to reduce his family to poverty.[5] His rule for funerals was: 'The coffin should be three inches thick, sufficient to hold the bones. The shroud should be of three pieces, sufficient to cover the flesh. The grave should not be of such a depth as to reach water, yet deep enough to ensure that no odours will arise. The mound should be just high enough to be identified. Weeping is permissible on the way to and from the interment, but then there should be a return to work to produce clothing and food.'[6]

[1] Cf. *Hirth Anniversary Volume*, p. 617.

[2] Cf. *Three Ways of Thought*, p. 169.

[3] Cf. *Chinese Political Thought*, p. 103.

[4] De Groot (*loc. cit.*, pp. 666-682) gives the text of the chapter on Economy in Funeral Rites, together with a translation. This is the earliest translation of this chapter into any European language.

[5] *Mo-tzŭ* xxv. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 300; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 76 f.; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 125. See also de Groot, *loc. cit.*, pp. 668 f.

[6] *Mo-tzŭ* xxv. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 312; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 83; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 134. See also de Groot, *loc. cit.*, p. 681.

But custom is hard to defy, and Mencius tells us that even Mo-tzŭ's disciples who continued his teaching had not strength to put them into practice. We read: 'The Mohist, Î Chih, sought, through Hsü Pî, to see Mencius . . . Mencius said . . . 'I have heard that this Î is a Mohist. Now Mo considers that in the regulation of funeral matters a spare simplicity should be the rule. Î thinks with Mo's doctrines to change the customs of the kingdom —how does he regard them as if they were wrong, and not honour them? Notwithstanding his views, Î buried his parents in a sumptuous manner, and so he served them in the way which his doctrines discountenance.' [1]

Of Mo-tzŭ's own sincerity and consistency there can be no doubt, however, and it is clear that the frugality and asceticism that he both practised and inculcated was not born of a dour spirit that loved asceticism for its own sake, or that sought to mortify the flesh, but rather of his eagerness for service and his recognition of the claims of others.

Passing over other aspects of the teaching of this sage, including his political theory which has reminded modern authors of the 'social contract' theory,[2] we must look finally at the religious element in his thought. Hu Shih says he is the only Chinese who can truly be said to have founded a religion,[3] and Wieger that he is the only Chinese writer of whom one can suppose that he believed in God.[4] His term for God is Heaven—a term which is already found frequently on the lips of Confucius. But Confucius was certainly not profoundly religious, and Mo-tzŭ seems to fill the term with more content than he did. It is true that

[1] *Mencius* III, Part I, v. 1, 2, translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, ii, 2nd ed., pp. 257 f. Cf. Couvreur, *Les Quatre Livres*, pp. 430 f.; Wilhelm, *Mong Dsi*, p. 59; Lyall, *Mencius*, p. 82.

[2] *Mo-tzŭ* xi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 214 f.; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 36 f.; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 f.

[3] *Development of Logical Method*, p. 57.

[4] Cf. *Histoire des Croyances*, p. 207 = E.T., p. 207): 'Le seul écrivain chinois dont on puisse penser qu'il crut en Dieu, le seul apôtre de la charité et chevalier du droit que la Chine ait produit.' Granet (*La pensée chinoise*, p. 492 n.) comments on this: 'Dans ce dithyrambe imprudent, il y a, pour le moins, quelque légèreté.' Hoang Tsen-yue (*op. cit.*, p. 95) adopts Wieger's words and even goes beyond him: 'Mo tseu ou Mécius est, avant Jésus, le seul apôtre de l'altruisme et le plus grand chevalier du droit qu'ait produit le monde.'

there are passages which indicate that Confucius thought of Heaven as a conscious and purposive power that was cognizant of human affairs,[1] but his belief in God was not the spring of life for him. He preferred to keep at a respectful distance from God and to let the world of the spiritual be left as far as possible out of his conversation.[2] With Mo-tzŭ, however, it is otherwise. His appeal is frequently to the will of Heaven. Aggressive war is condemned because it is contrary to the will of Heaven,[3] and to love all men is declared to be but obedience to the same will.[4] Moreover, Heaven not alone wills that men should love, but exemplifies that love. For Heaven loves the whole world, and proves that love by visiting with calamity those who sin against their fellows.[5] For Mo-tzŭ firmly held the view that all sin of man against man is yet more profoundly sin against Heaven.

It is not without interest to observe that in his thought the divine punishment of human wickedness is an expression of the love of Heaven. In this he is at one with Old Testament prophets, with whom he has, not surprisingly, been compared.[6] When Amos said in the name of God : ' You only have I known of all the families of the earth : therefore will I visit upon you your iniquities ',[7] he perceived that a God who was indifferent to human sin would not be a God of love. And Mo-tzŭ perceived the same truth.

From this it is clear that for him Heaven is personal. Rawlinson observes : ' Micius seems to have conceived of T'ien [8]

[1] Cf. what I have written in the BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, xxiv, 1940, p. 337.

[2] Cf. *Analects* vi. 20 : ' To give oneself earnestly to the duties due to men, and while respecting spiritual beings, to keep aloof from them, may be called wisdom ' (translation of Legge, *The Chinese Classics*, i, 2nd ed., p. 191) ; *Analects* vii. 20 : ' The subjects on which the Master did not talk were extraordinary things, feats of strength, disorder, and spiritual beings ' (translation of Legge, *ibid.*, p. 201).

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xxvii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, pp. 322 ff. ; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 89 ; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 142 f.

[4] *Mo-tzŭ* xxviii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 333 ; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 95 ; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[5] *Mo-tzŭ* xxviii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 334 ; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 96 ; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.

[6] Cf. Wallace, *Chinese Recorder*, lxii, 1931, p. 559 : ' His emphasis on the doctrine of righteousness is comparable to that given it in the old Testament.' Wilhelm compares Mo-tzŭ to Savonarola (*Die chinesischen Literatur*, p. 56).

[7] Amos iii. 2.

[8] I.e. Heaven.

as a person though he does not explicitly say so. He did, however, refer to him in personalistic terms. T'ien is, for instance, *interested* in the welfare of men .'[1] In my view this could be stated with much more emphasis. The Heaven that is marked by a loving will, and that cherishes a moral purpose, and that not alone makes high demands of men but exemplifies the qualities it asks of them, is no mere impersonal force, but a living and personal Power.[2]

This would seem to be implied too, by Mo-tzŭ's vigorous opposition to any belief in blind, impersonal Fate. 'Fatalism is disastrous to the world' he said.[3] He urged that, instead of supposing their misfortunes were due to the whims of Fate, men should recognize that there was a moral Power behind the universe. 'He who obeys the will of Heaven', we read, 'entering into the universal mutual love (*chien hsiang ai*) and the mutual conferring of benefits (*chiao hsiang li*), will obtain rewards, while he who resists the will of Heaven, being moved with a discriminating mutual hatred (*pieh hsiang wu*) and the mutual doing of injury (*chiao hsiang tsê*), will incur punishment.[4] Heaven is therefore righteous, and the will of Heaven for man is that he should do righteousness.[5] The will of

[1] Cf. *Chinese Recorder*, lxiii, 1932, p. 95.

[2] Cf. Williamson, *op. cit.*, p. 35: 'In fact, it would seem that the personal interpretation is the only one which meets the case'; Wilhelm, *Die chinesischen Literatur*, p. 57: 'Sein Glaube an einen persönlichen Gott': Forke, *Mê Ti*, p. 40: 'Der Himmel ist für Mê Ti das höchste Wesen, Gott . . . Mê-tse sieht im Himmel nicht nur das sich über uns ausbreitende Himmelsgewölbe mit den Gestirnen, sondern ein anthropomorphes Wesen': Krause, *Ju-Tao-Fo*, 1924, p. 89: 'Die oberste Kraft des Himmels erhält bei Mo Ti einen neuen Sinn, nicht nur als unpersönliche Naturgewalt, sondern als ein höchstes Wesen im Sinne, eines allmächtigen Gottes': Witte, *Mê Ti*, p. 11: 'Vom Himmel selbst und seinem Wirken wird bei Mê Ti in solchen Ausdrücken geredet, dass man fast zu dem Urteil kommen könnte, der Himmel sei nach Mê Ti eine persönliche Gottheit, ähnlich wie in den ältesten, chinesischen heiligen Schriften von der obersten Gottheit, Schang-ti, gesprochen wird.' Witte, however, holds that Mo-tzŭ was a pantheist, rather than a theist (*ibid.*).

[3] *Mo-tzŭ* xxxvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 387; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 96; Mei, *op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.

[4] *Mo-tzŭ* xxvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 317; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 86; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

[5] *Mo-tzŭ* xxvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 316; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 85; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

Heaven is therefore as compasses to the wheelwright, and the square to the carpenter.[1]

It seems therefore surprising that many modern writers depreciate Mo-tzŭ as a religious teacher. De Rosny set him down as a very mediocre teacher, and went on to declare that it could not be otherwise with a thinker who appears to have been devoid of any idea of God.[2] Similarly Alexandra David found Mo-tzŭ's Heaven to be a pale substitute for God.[3] Others have maintained that his Heaven was but a lay figure to be clothed with his own ideas. Mei reaches the conclusion that 'with Motze religion is functional and social, and an organic part of his ethics'[4] and that he 'personified social values for their preservation and enhancement. He threw a religious halo around his fundamental ethical convictions, and lifted his doctrines to the commanding position of creeds.'[5] Similarly Wallace: 'Motse's argument is always a utilitarianism, and the thing is then given an additional reference to Heaven, which is so nominal that the argument is not strengthened by it.'[6]

All this seems to me to be much less than fair to Mo-tzŭ, and to rest on an exaggerated emphasis on his utilitarianism and a gross under-estimate of his teaching of Heaven. Mei observes that 'what Heaven desires is just what Motse has been teaching himself'.[7] But how could it be otherwise? If Mo-tzŭ believed

[1] *Mo-tzŭ* xxvi. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 320; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 87; Mei, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[2] Cf. *Études de Critique et d'Histoire* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences Religieuses, vii), 1896, p. 299: 'La doctrine de Meh-tse . . . est d'une assez mediocre portée . . . Il ne pouvait d'ailleurs en être autrement chez un penseur qui semble n'avoir pas eu la moindre aperception de l'idée de Dieu et qui, par conséquent, n'a pu concevoir un motif d'Amour supérieur aux appels de la chair et du sang.'

[3] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 142: 'Si l'on nous y propose l'imitation du Ciel "dont les dons généreux se répandent sur tous" c'est uniquement pour nous donner un haut exemple, celui de la nature et nous ne pourrions, quelque désir que nous en ayons, rien y trouver qui ressemble au commandement d'une Puissance supérieure.'

[4] Cf. Motse, *Rival of Confucius*, p. 157.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 158. Cf. Holth, *op. cit.*, p. 48; Kennedy, *Chinese Recorder*, lxii, 1931, p. 698.

[6] Cf. *Chinese Recorder*, lxii, 1931, p. 560. Cf. Suzuki, *Brief History of Early Chinese Philosophy*, 1914, p. 100.

[7] Cf. *Motse, Rival of Confucius*, p. 149.

that in the will of God was the supreme law for man, then he would necessarily set forth what he believed to be the content of that will. It can scarcely be maintained that he would have proved himself more truly religious if he had said 'The will of Heaven is one thing, but what I advocate is another'!

It is true that he emphasizes only certain sides of religion. He is not much interested in the forms of worship. But neither were the Old Testament prophets. Yet they are allowed to have been religious teachers. Mo-tzŭ accepts the current forms, but with something of the spirit of the prophets he demands that those forms should be validated by obedience to the will of God in daily life. In his day he found hollow sacrifices being offered. Says Fung: 'The Confucian school, or at least a part of it, did not believe in the existence of supernatural beings, yet at the same time stressed the performance of sacrifice in order to give emotional satisfaction. Looked at from the point of view of Mohist utilitarianism, performance of sacrifices under such circumstances is meaningless.'[1] Mo-tzŭ himself said: 'To hold that there are no spirits and yet to learn the sacrificial rites is like refusing to entertain a guest and yet studying the forms of hospitality, or like denying the existence of fish and yet making a fishing net.'[2] Mo-tzŭ's emphasis is not on the forms of religion, because he did not think the urgent need of the world was for a reform of those forms, but for a life which conformed to the will of God and a character that reflected God's love.

As a religious teacher he is to be criticized rather in that his Heaven is too remote. His character and will are made known to men, but His fellowship is not offered them as the living fountain of their strength to obey His will. Mo-tzŭ himself did not come to men with a 'Thus saith the Lord', proclaiming a word which he had received in the immediacy of fellowship with God. Nor does he call upon men to love God with a love that responds to His own. As a religious teacher he is cold and rational. Yet that should not make us withhold from him appreciation of the greatness of his spirit and of the loftiness of his teaching. God hath

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 90 f.

[2] *Mo-tzŭ* xlviii. Cf. Forke, *op. cit.*, p. 569; Tomkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 139; Mei, *Works of Motse*, p. 236.

not left Himself without witness amongst men of many races, and though we may find their witness to be ' by divers portions and in divers manners ' we may honour their memory for their greatness. Few amongst them attained the heights of self-sacrifice and unselfishness that Mo-tzŭ attained, and none was more earnest in his desire for a world in which the will of God should be perfectly done. His conception of that world was forbidding and unlovely, in that it was a comfortless world of unceasing toil, and he insufficiently recognized the place of the natural relationships of men. In both respects his over-emphasis finds its justification in the setting of his times, and if Mo-tzŭ can scarcely be thought of as the universal teacher for all ages, he can be recognized to have been a teacher whose message was urgently needed in his own day. Perhaps that is why his words filled the empire in his own age, and then suffered neglect.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY.[1]

By T. H. PEAR, M.A., B.Sc.
PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

I WISH to discuss the relations between Psychology and Sociology. I will try to give reasons for the belief that to-day they are practically important as well as theoretically interesting.

" Subjects ", Professor Ralph Linton has observed, " have a way of getting themselves embalmed in university syllabuses ". Sociology is no exception, yet it is relevant to mention that it can be found in few British University syllabuses, but many American ones. This contrast does not necessarily imply that a negligible amount of sociological research is going on in this country, for there are serious differences of opinion concerning the definition and scope of sociology. Part of my task to-day is to discuss them.

While reading the literature on this subject it is important to bear in mind that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between a subject and a vested interest, and that non-academic persons often have a clearer view about a subject's definition and limitations than has the specialist who ' professes ' it. Furthermore, a definition of a subject, accepted a generation ago, may later have widened so much that it becomes unwieldy. Consequently the subject may divide by fission, either because of the growing force inside it, or through structural weakness. Or other more highly integrated subjects may surround and press in upon it until it is splintered, like a ship between ice-floes. This may be happening to sociology, as the term is understood here, yet work by people who would be called sociologists by some, and social psychologists by others, is not inconsiderable.

Instead of seeking formal definitions at this point let us ask

[1] An amplification of the lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 10th of March, 1948.

" What are sociologists and psychologists doing, and what speculations seem reasonable concerning their future activities ? "

In an article, " Psychology and Sociology ", written nearly twelve years ago, Professor Morris Ginsberg succinctly outlines the position at that time. Yet in the last twelve years much has happened, and in 1936 the world was calmer than it is now. So it seems that if a sociologist has discussed the relation between psychology and sociology, beginning from his end, it might be useful for a psychologist to begin from the other (as, indeed, Professor Godfrey H. Thomson did, in the symposium which contained Professor Ginsberg's paper) and try to build a bridge. Professor Thomson said, " I do not think that sociological applications are often mentioned in the psychology class." Perhaps that is less true now.

One view of the social psychologist's proper approach to a sociological theme is that he first observes how it affects his own experience and behaviour ; then notices how accounts by other human beings differ from his own. So I hope it will not be tedious for you if I proceed outward from my own centre, describing and commenting upon relevant events in my lifetime.

I was instructed in general psychology at three different Universities. The courses given by different types of teacher (this fact is of psychological interest) were correspondingly varied.[1] The first was at King's College, London, by Professor C. S. Myers and Dr. William Brown ; the second at University College, London, by Professor C. E. Spearman ; the third at Würzburg, by Professors Oswald Külpe and Karl Bühler. So far as I remember, in none of these courses did I hear anything about social psychology in the sense in which the word is now used.

In a course on " Comparative Psychology ", by Professor Carveth Read, I learnt facts about people from far away, " primitives " and " savages ", and heard speculations about how their minds worked. Behaviourism had hardly begun, nor had the *Gestalt* psychology, at least under that name. There were witty references to our own society, especially to the more obvious disorders of behaviour when under the stress of emotion—this was

[1] A fuller account is given in the writer's " Industrial Psychology as I Have Seen It ", *Occupational Psychology*, July 1948.

a slightly embarrassing subject—or when congregating in crowds. Gustav Le Bon's *The Crowd*[1] still held sway, so crowds were usually assumed to be collections of people who should normally be dispersed with grape-shot, or ordered to move on.

My teachers, all very sociable men, seldom spoke of society; they were concerned with establishing general Laws of Mind, the focus of their speculations and research was nomothetic. Every now and then, as when Alfred Binet's comparison of the mental imagery of his two daughters was cited, one realised the importance of individual differences, yet about the psychological problems of society I heard nothing.

For me, as for so many students of psychology, a great event was the appearance of Professor William McDougall's *Introduction to Social Psychology*,[2] I read it entranced, and returned to it again and again. For years afterwards, many taught "social psychology" almost exclusively from this book, ignoring its author's warning that it was but an elaborate packing for a journey which was never taken. In my opinion the later writings of Dewey, Ross and others in America never achieved McDougall's eloquent persuasiveness.

Much later, I saw how at that time McDougall took for granted many facts which to-day offer us fascinating problems. Of these, two were his own social stratum, and his nationality.[3] Then in a summer holiday I read an article by Dr. Hadley Cantril, "The Social Psychology of Everyday Life".[4] I have never been the same man since. It analysed and compared the treatments of sociology and social psychology by contemporary writers in English. He made a striking point; one might have expected expositions by social psychologists to be rich in concrete examples, since presumably they were working outward from themselves. Sociologists, looking for laws of social behaviour, with relative disregard of the individual, might have been assumed to lean towards general treatment. Yet in the books he cited, the opposite tendency was obvious. At that time American sociologists

[1] 1903, London. [2] London, Methuen.

[3] T. H. Pear, "The Social Status of the Psychologist and Its Effect Upon His Work", *Sociological Review*, 1942, Vol. 34.

[4] *Psychological Bulletin*, 1934, pp. 297-330.

seemed to offer more concrete examples of hypotheses, concepts or theories.

Cantril pointed out that the social psychology of everyday life was almost neglected. Subjects like gossip and rumour were regarded as hardly suitable for academic interest. His article convinced me that little could be said in defence of this neglect of the social phenomena of everyday life. Not all psychologists took this view, and in 1940 I read a paper, "The Trivial and Popular in Psychology", before the British Psychological Society.[1] Its reception was ambivalent. The discussion which followed it showed a confusion between "pure science", the purity of a scientist's motives, and the desire for the esteem of colleagues in related University departments. In those days it was supposed or tacitly agreed that "pure" scientists were harmless. Yet the events at Hiroshima were only five years away. Interest and controversy about social psychology are guaranteed, now that attitude measurement, public opinion polls, participant observers and mass observation are so widely discussed.

Between 1935 and 1938 a team of English sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists tried to plug some gaps in the record of our knowledge of methods and problems by producing *The Study of Society*.[2] The early reviews of it (it appeared just before World War II) criticized it chiefly for sins of omission. Yet because each writer contributed something about some subject which appeared to have been relatively neglected in England, the book inevitably has little outline, and no streamline. My own contribution was a commentary upon what seemed important problems of social psychology in 1937. It is not uninteresting to compare the contents of this book with those of more recent ones like Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb's *Experimental Social Psychology*, Hadley Cantril's *The Psychology of Social Movements* and Kimball Young's *Handbook of Social Psychology*.[3]

To-day there is no need to emphasize the importance of the social psychology of everyday life, yet for some psychologists social

[1] *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 31, 1940, pp. 115-128.

[2] Edited by F. C. Bartlett and others, London, 1939, Kegan Paul.

[3] London, 1946, Kegan Paul.

psychology is merely a small branch of psychology. Their views contract with another one, that since man as a solitary animal is never found naturally, all human psychology is social psychology, and individual psychology considers the person by abstracting him (often illegitimately) from his social environment. For such thinkers, even 'individual' matters like colour-vision, smell or taste are viewed from the social standpoint. The first is viewed as important in selection tests for occupations; the second and third are considered in a social and occasionally in a commercial setting.

Though nowadays this point of view is common, it is relatively novel. To early experimenters on memory, the individual result seemed significant chiefly in so far as it could be ground up with all the others to furnish a Law of Forgetting. Then came interest in the person as a rememberer. F. C. Bartlett's research on serial reproduction [1] demonstrated the social factors in recall, and the recent book on the *Psychology of Rumour*, by G. W. Allport and L. Postman,[2] deals extensively with them.

The re-introduction of the ego into psychology [3,4] stresses its social setting. The introduction of the concepts of level of aspiration [5] and of ego-involvement [6] suggests that all psychology eventually may be regarded as social psychology.

Social psychology may be defined as the positive science of experience and behaviour so far as these are affected by social relationships.

Professor Leslie A. White of Michigan University has recently written [7] that professional psychologists were slow to appreciate the significance of super-individual determinants of human behaviour. Consequently science organized its forces under

[1] *Remembering*, Cambridge University Press.

[2] 1947, New York, Henry Holt.

[3] Gordon W. Allport, "The Ego in Contemporary Psychology", 1943, *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50, pp. 451-478.

[4] Hadley Cantril, "The Place of Personality in Social Psychology", from *Journal of Psychology*, 1947, 24, 19-56.

[5] *Personality and the Behaviour Disorders*, edited by J. Mc. V. Hunt, 1944, New York, Ronald Press Co., Vol. 1, pp. 333-378.

[6] M. Sherif and Hadley Cantril, *The Psychology of Ego-Involvements.*

[7] "The Expansion of the Scope of Science", *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 37, No. 6, 15th June, 1947, pp. 181-210.

another banner to undertake this necessary task. This new movement was sociology. Because the current of thought ran too exclusively to analysis and explanation in terms of the single human being, sociology arose as a discipline for the study of the collective life of man. In the early years, it was considered as properly beginning at the point where psychology left off. The superindividual determinants of behaviour were social in nature, consequently sociology became the science of society.

Psychology bestirred itself meanwhile, and gradually expanded its scope to include the superindividual determinants. William James displayed a fine appreciation of social factors in behaviour in the chapter, " The Consciousness of Self " in his *Principles of Psychology* (1890). J. M. Baldwin predicted that " the psychology of the future will be social to the core ". In 1908 William McDougall published his *Social Psychology*[1] . . . the first work bearing this title written by a psychologist. E. A. Ross's *Social Psychology*, the first work bearing this title by a sociologist, was published in the same year.

White shows that psychology still remained anchored to the individual as the object for its studies. He quotes G. F. Stout and C. A. Mace,[2] Floyd H. Allport and Margaret F. Washburn, who all take this point of view, one of them so late as 1924.

Accordingly, White says, psychology was unable to envisage a psychological system composed of many individuals instead of only one, a social as well as a biological organism, and this field was left pretty much to the sociologists.

All the same, it seems doubtful if Professor White's " system composed of many individuals instead of only one " is psychical in nature. An example of a system is a platoon of soldiers marching. The better their training in movement, the freer are they to think their own thoughts, which will differ even if they all fixate the 'marker'. And in a football team, the different terms for the positions occupied by individuals remind us that the full-back, the scrum-half and the forward have different experiences. Unity of action and identity of experience are not synonymous.

[1] It is important to note that the actual title is *An Introduction to Social Psychology*.

[2] Article, " Psychology ", *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition.

An illegitimate parallel is made when a social organism is likened to a bodily one. One's body is governed in a great part by the laws of physiology ; one's social club is not. Yet a well-run club is a perfect example of a social organism.

White continues :—

"Sociology was to deal with the group aspect (of behaviour). Give sociology time to mature, many thought, and the science of human behaviour would be complete, for with the individual and collective behaviour taken care of what else was there ? To many sociologists of the 1890's and early 1900's it had appeared, as it had to Comte many decades earlier, that at last the 'hierarchy' of the science was complete, that sociology was to be the crown or capstone of the great edifice that was science. But these hopes and aspirations have not been realized. Sociology has not become the head of an impressive hierarchy of the sciences. On the contrary, many scholars, both within sociology and outside, raise the question 'Is sociology a science at all ?' Whatever accomplishments sociology does have to its credit, it certainly has failed to fulfil the hopes and expectations of Comte and subsequent generations of sociologists."

He thinks that sociology merely rounded off the science of psychology by making it a study of "collective aspects of behaviour as well as of individual aspects ".

Here there seems an ambiguity. Is "the individual aspect of behaviour " its subjective aspect ? The goal-keeper, catching and kicking a ball into safety, can describe his experience. But if the collective aspect means the collective consciousness or awareness of the whole team, I can give this phrase no introspective meaning. Few experienced and psychologically-trained administrators regard the phrase, used for public consumption ; "The committee was of one mind ", as literally true. They have often seen last-minute pressure upon dissidents turn '*nem con*' into 'unanimous'. It is highly improbable that any decision arrived at after hours of active discussion could be experienced identically by all voters.

Here I turn back nostalgically to the late Dr. W. H. R. Rivers' suggestion made in 1916.[1] Paraphrased slightly, it is that sociology should deal with social behaviour, with what is being done, and psychology with the experiences of persons behaving socially.

Sociologists did not accept this suggestion, for varied reasons. Of these one is hardly cogent, that this division would deprive sociology of all interest. This would seem to be the opinion

[1] "Psychology and Sociology ", *Sociological Review*, 1916.

of a sociologist who wants (naturally enough) to do psychological work.

Perhaps another reason was that if working in these limitations sociology might become social 'behaviourism'. Yet this would have been very useful, as Rivers showed in his examination of Professor Westermarck's views concerning the blood-feud, and marriage. Moreover, in working out culture-pattern problems, one must distinguish between a sanctioned and behavioural pattern, between explicit and implicit culture, even between 'pattern' and 'configuration'[1] and if more observers would record social behaviour as such, apart from any imputed motive, many culture-pattern studies would be valuably illuminated.

Professor Ginsberg has discussed different views concerning the proper relations between psychology and sociology. They may be summarized thus:

1. Sociology and psychology are, and for long must remain, distinct disciplines with distinct methods and aims.
2. Sociology, which is concerned with the behaviour of men in society, is nothing but applied psychology. This is Freud's view.
3. Human nature is socially and historically conditioned, therefore not psychological but social factors determine whether a particular idea will gain adherents. This is the view of Marx.

Ginsberg summarizes reasons which have been given for assigning a relatively minor role, in social studies, to psychology. One is the alleged immaturity of those parts of psychology which may be useful in dealing with social phenomena. Rivers took this view thirty-two years ago, but those who have followed the growth of social psychology since then may reasonably wish to ask anyone who repeats this doubt a few questions to test his detailed knowledge. It is worth mentioning that the Clapham "Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research" (Cmd. 6868, H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1946), was drawn up by a body of men which included distin-

[1] T. H. Pear, "Psychological Implications of the Culture-Pattern Theory" and "Personality in its Cultural Context," BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, 1945-1946, Vols. 29 and 30.

guished economists and social philosophers but no sociologist or psychologist.

Again, it has been urged that we are more likely to obtain insight into the nature of mental forms by directly studying social facts than by studying the individual mind. But this argument, says Ginsberg, scarcely bears on a more concrete social psychology, which refuses to accept the implied sharp contrast between inborn constant elements in human nature and those which are affected by social environment.

The exclusion of psychology may be incidental to the use of the 'abstract' method in social science, e.g. economics. To state this is to criticize the use of the abstract method. The authors of *The Social Sciences*[1] write

"... The study of economics in Britain has in the past suffered from an over emphasis on the deductive method. The significance of a theory, or of a piece of research, has usually been judged in relation to its former elegance rather than to its correspondence with reality. It has even been asserted that the findings of economic theory depend not upon the facts of the real world but are 'implicit in our definition of the subject matter of economic science as a whole'. The concealed social premises of a priori economics have seldom been considered important enough to warrant investigation. This tradition in economics is probably much to blame for the present dearth of applied economic studies in Britain. It has commonly been regarded as more important to analyse the working of some imaginary economic system, bearing little relation to reality than to show how the economic system operates in the real world. The result of this divorce of theory from practice has been that graduates in economics have left the universities equipped with a much less practical understanding of economic reality than they are entitled to expect after three or four years' study. If they enter government service or industry in positions in which economics is of direct value to them, they probably find that whilst they may have a certain technical facility in using economic conceptions, many of their existing ideas have too little relevance to the realities with which they are confronted.

Recently there have been brilliant exceptions to this generalisation, and it is in virtue of these that British economics enjoys a high reputation. But many further changes are needed. In particular, since most of the more important conclusions of economics cannot be reached without the use of economic statistics, there is a strong case for making elementary statistical methods at least a more general part of the standard equipment of economics. In conclusion, it is not enough to train more economists and economic research workers. Further progress must be made in bringing the academic study of economics into the closest touch with reality. ..."

[1] Cf. *The Social Sciences, A Case for their Greater Use*, 1948. Association of Scientific Workers, 15 Half Moon Street, London, W.1; T. H. Marshall, *Sociology at the Cross Roads*, 1947, Longmans Green, London.

Further criticism comes from Professor Robert S. Lynd in his paper, "The Implications of Economic Planning for Sociology."[1]

A further possible reason for the relative exclusion of psychology from the social sciences may be the natural desire to draw clear lines of division between them. Yet this makes it possible for anyone who does not want to be bothered in his work by sociological implications to say that the word has meant so many things that it is now practically meaningless. He does not deny the existence of the study, but, by defining it as a nonentity, suggests its unimportance. And such a thinker is unlikely to make trouble for himself by trying to mark off sociology from psychology.

A natural reason for soft-pedalling the importance of psychological factors in attempting to explain any complicated social phenomena such as warfare, is the fear that extra-psychological factors may be neglected. It should be clear that no psychologist can expect to obtain a hearing if, when discussing war, he neglects the extra-psychological, especially the economic factors.[2] But there is a sense in which all factors which cause any single person to engage, or refuse to engage, in warfare, are ultimately psychological. Food shortage causes hunger, atrocity stories arouse hatred, the need for *Lebensraum* acts psychologically upon anyone who believes in it. Economic depression may cause desperate people to behave extravagantly. In all these instances it is the psychological factor which ultimately causes the anti-social behaviour. Totalitarian war cannot exist without mass-communications. Even so recently as the beginning of this century many 'educated' people in England had the vaguest notions about the Boer War, and took little interest in it except when the besieged towns were relieved.

Professor Ginsberg mentions some directions in which social psychologists might link psychology with the social sciences :

To discover elements in the human mind which specifically affect man's social relations and the respective parts played in

[1] *American Sociological Review*, 1944, pp. 14-20.

[2] T. H. Pear, "Peace, War and Culture-Patterns", BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, 1947, Vol. 31.

collective life by inborn and unconscious drives, and the extent to which these are modified by intelligent guidance.

To find out the psychological peculiarities of racial, national or professional groups or social classes, and the conditions which govern these peculiar group mentalities.

To describe the role of individual differences in intelligence or character, in determining the nature of social groups and social change.

To provide a fuller classification of social groups and strata and to develop a technique for observation and recording.

He says :

" Social psychology appears to have concentrated unduly on the search for the constant and invariable elements in human nature, which it has tended to identify with the innate or genetically determined. This has had the psychological effect of leaving the variations to be interpreted in non-psychological terms, or else making them appear utterly arbitrary and thus encouraging a relativistic and subjectivist view of human affairs. To counter this mood, we need not only an ethics but also a deeper psychological study of human motivation in varying concrete situations. Encouraging beginnings have been made in this direction in the study of the social life of children, in clinical psychology and in criminology, and the methods developed may prove useful in other social fields. The material that is now being collected in different countries and under different social situations may eventually facilitate comparative studies and render possible a more accurate determination of the role of mind in society."

An example may illustrate several relations between psychology and sociology. An attempt to throw light upon English professional groups and social classes is in progress in the department of Psychology of Manchester University, where Mrs. Nancy E. Robertson and Dr. J. A. Waites are investigating with me the social and educational background of the rulers of England.[1]

Our first aim was to discover social facts from which psychological data can be obtained, and to contribute to individual social psychology.

Answers were received to 67 per cent. of questionnaires sent in 1946 to Members of Parliament. Many gave additional unsolicited information which will be valuable for psychological purposes.

[1] " The Present House of Commons ; its Educational and Social Background ", *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 37, 1947, pp. 96-108.

To the English judges were sent the same questionnaire, and 69 per cent. answered. This is psychologically interesting, as it suggests that our judges, though mysterious, are not secretive. Here again the use of information from volunteered supplementary letters will be psychological.

In England there has been an incomplete separation of sociology from psychology. This has been commented upon in various ways. In an article "The Future of Sociology",[1] Mr. Tom Harrisson asserts that in the philosophical approach to sociology "great laws of human behaviour are produced without observation", as in Le Bon's alleged classic, *The Crowd*. This still exercises a high-level influence on University curricula and research training. A weakness, in his opinion, is the sociologist's absorption in quantitive methods, which attempt maximum impersonality, to satisfy purely mathematical criteria. This 'objective' sociology is set over against what he calls 'subjective' sociology, which, in the absence of a definition, I take means the conjuring-up in the consciousness of a single thinker, of alleged social laws.

Harrisson defines sociology as "the study of human relations and institutions and of social behaviour under the 'natural' conditions of human society". By inference, sociology is primarily concerned with the 'civilised' peoples, anthropology is its equivalent among the so-called 'primitive' peoples.

The subjects may have grown up in this way, yet if this distinction be insisted upon, sociology and anthropology in future are liable to have their boundaries smudged. It is evidence for Harrisson's view that not many years ago at a Cambridge meeting an anthropologist caused excitement by suggesting that instead of training students to investigate strange people in distant lands it would be valuable for some of them to study the complicated relations existing between 'Town' and 'Gown'.

"Social psychology", says Harrisson, "involves an understanding penetration of normal situations and environments." One might subscribe to this, demurring that "understanding penetration of normal situations" is not enough. Many ab-

[1] "The Future of Sociology", *Pilot Papers*, II, No 1, March 1947, pp. 10-25.

normal situations need the studies of a social psychologist, who will approach them in a way different from that of the psychiatrist. There is too a strong case for training psychiatric social workers in the methods of social psychology. He considers that industrial psychology should largely be industrial sociology (a view not shared by all industrial psychologists) and cites Lord Keynes's prophecy that the day is not far off when the Economic Problem will take a back seat where it belongs, and the arena of the heart and the head will be occupied by our real problems, problems of life and human relations, of creation and behaviour and religion.

In America, in the last decade, the amount of sociological work has been immense. Since it has been impossible for an Englishman to keep up with it, in order to bring some proportion into my general picture I borrow with grateful acknowledgements from Dr. Edward A. Shils' article "The Present Situation in American Sociology."[1] He asserts that discussions of the nature of sociology and its proper methodology have contributed little to the development of research in American sociology. This, for some decades, has "aroused the admiration and uncomfortable repugnance" in European colleagues as a result of its enthusiastically detailed description of social life in the contemporary U.S.A.

As we have seen, in striking contrast with Europe, American sociology is immersed in first-hand experience of concrete situations.

The men of learning and synthetic disposition of the first generation of American sociologists, of whom Lester F. Ward was perhaps the greatest, have passed without a trace; his works are practically never referred to in any piece of research. The same is true of Franklin H. Giddings, the versatile and erudite incumbent of the Chair of Sociology at Columbia University. The generation which came just after them, Robert E. Park, W. I. Thomas, C. H. Cooley, and Edward Ross, stood midway between the sociology of the library and learned meditation on the one hand, and the increasingly circumspect research techniques of the present day on the other. They have had a profound

[1] *Pilot Papers*, Spring 1947.

influence both in their establishment of a precedent which requires sociologists to describe and explain the modern world, through their heritage of numerous, penetrating, though usually only implicit, hypotheses and the delineation of objects and categories of investigation.

For local reasons, e.g. the geographical position of the University of Chicago and of Columbia University in New York City, the problems of metropolitan and small-town life have been in the focus of American research. These studies have not usually been motivated by a central scientific problem or by any clearly defined hypothesis—they represent simply an attempt " to see the life of the community as a whole " in all its concreteness. They culminated in Robert and Helen Lynd's classic *Middletown.*[1] More recent are *Small Town Stuff, The Social Life of a Modern Community, A Chinese Village* and *Plainville, U.S.A.* The latter three investigations represent deviation from the traditional type of sociological community study, introducing new techniques of description and new categories of subject matter, e.g. child training and weaning.

Later, for Robert E. Park, the loosening and disruption of communal bonds and the increase in personal freedom were the main facts of modern society, and Chicago monographs described this. Their titles, *The Gang, The Ghetto, The Gold Coast and the Slum, Vice and Organised Crime in Chicago, Taxi Dance Hall,* are self-explanatory.

These are disconnected investigations, for the contemplations of wholes has never taken root in the U.S.A. as a fundamental scientific attitude.

Community study has undergone a reorganization, attention being particularly focused on specific problems. *Middletown in Transition,*[2] appearing eight years after the original *Middletown,* revealed this trend sharply. The class structure of Muncie, Indiana (the real name of Middletown) came far more prominently into the foreground. Dominance of the X family unified the work.

' We Americans ', a study of Burlington, Vermont, describes

[1] 1929, New York. [2] 1937, New York.

the pattern of relations among ethnic groups. 'Yankee City' series (a comprehensive study of Newburyport, Rhode Island) became primarily the study of differences in social status and how they relate to associational membership and ethnic origin.

So from this original stream of activity, there has been precipitated out an increasingly clear awareness of the necessity of approaching reality with specific hypotheses concerning the relation amongst various classes of events. In some instances, specific and concrete hypotheses are being subsumed under more general series as in the works of Childe, Dollard, Merton, Kluckhohn, MacGregor.

The view that all particular instances of behaviour must be interpreted against the structural field of which they are a part (developed from another angle by the late Kurt Lewin) leads to a new mutual fructification of 'social psychological' and 'sociological' studies.

The growing sympathy of American anthropologists like Benedict, Kluckhohn, Hallowell and Linton with one form or another of psychoanalysis is helpful because it introduces general hypothesis about human behaviour and counteracts the renewed tendency towards inventory-making.

Social stratification has become an increasingly frequent object of investigation in the past decade. An important achievement of American sociology is the invention of new techniques for the study of deference-aspects of this much talked about but hitherto seldom systematically studied subject matter. Prior to the great depression, American sociologists had not been much concerned with the class structure of society, with differences in the status of occupation and income groups, or with the distribution of opportunities for movement amongst the various social strata. Nor was it any more interested in the power relations among the classes.

The principal urban sociological technique, the study of the correlation between median rental levels or small urban subdistricts and the social characteristics of the persons inhabiting the area, offered a great convenience in the study of class differences, but the opportunity was not exploited. The influence of class-position on family structure was not explored or the inverse

relationship considered to any notable degree. The role of the family in the inculcation of standards appropriate to a given status, a crucial phenomenon in the reproduction of a social system, was not treated prior to the studies of the Warner group in Chicago. Studies of juvenile delinquency took for granted class position and the relations between status demands on the one hand and income-determined opportunity on the other. The social class of parents of members of legislative bodies in the U.S.A. has not been analysed even for a single generation of legislators.

Theory in American sociology has in the past meant either a preoccupation with definitions and classifications, with methodological reflections on the nature of sociology, general uncontrolled observations unsullied by statistics or concrete data, or scholarly preoccupation with authors, who, in their own time, had produced works containing general uncontrolled observations. Sociology cannot advance beyond its present state in America unless 'the theory of x' or 'the sociology of y' cease to be the presentation of untested hypotheses, disdainful of research because it cannot explain every individual case or because research is presumed to deal only with the trivial and the unique.

In a recent broadcast [1] Professor Morris Ginsberg asked "What can the Social Sciences do for us?" Summarized, his answers were these:

If there is to be a war of ideologies, and we are bidden to take sides, we ought at least to be quite clear what it is we are to fight about. Here is the first task for sociological analysis.

We need to know far more than we do of the technique of power in large societies—above all how to prevent its abuse. This means that we need fuller knowledge of the power and limits of mass-suggestion in modern societies. We must study further the importance of infancy and early childhood for the formation of character.

More direct training is needed in the handling of social facts and in the methods which can be used to interpret and evaluate them.

A very recent contributor to this question—I saw his article

[1] *The Listener*, Vol. 39, No. 1008, 20th May, 1948, pp. 822-823.

after this lecture was drafted—is Professor G. D. H. Cole, who discusses "Sociology and Politics in the Twentieth Century." [1]

He writes:

"... Sociology grew up almost as an outlaw—at best, as an inferior branch of study, of which the role was held to be confined to analysis and comparison of the curious barbaric habits of primitive peoples, and to have no relevance to Politics or Economics, as studied in relation to the problems of the more advanced societies. Gradually, no doubt, this attitude is being discredited; but it still persists, because there now stands behind it both a powerful vested interest in the perpetuation of economic and political studies in the shapes which have become traditional in University examinations and teaching, and a strong doctrinal reluctance to face the need for a form of social analysis which, applied to large and complex societies, will inevitably be itself highly complex and destructive of explanations based on giving primary importance to any single factor in the social situation as a whole.

Great Britain, hitherto, has been the most resistant of all the leading countries to the acceptance of Sociology in any form....

... Sociology will not fit in with either Politics or Economics, as long as these two are conceived of as essentially separate and independent studies, each with its own laws. Yet so to conceive of them has been, for more than a century, an essential part of the British academic tradition—and indeed of the predominant British habit of thought in a far wider sense.

... The Sociological method is, of course, largely statistical. It studies social phenomena largely by counting instances, observing correlations, and thus building up a body of knowledge about social behaviour where numbers are involved. It discovers neither how a particular individual behaves—save incidentally, in the process of collecting its material—nor why men, in a preponderant number of instances, behave in a peculiar way. It may succeed in predicting how most people, or enough people to determine the main course of events, will behave in a particular situation; but it cannot tell how any single individual will behave. That is not its job. It is, however, the job of the social psychologist, if not to predict the behaviour of particular individuals, at all events to try to find out why individuals behave as they do, when they are acting socially—in the sense of acting as members of social groups or communities, or as reacting to what is expected of them in relation to social institutions, with which they are associated in one way or another. The fields of Sociology and Social Psychology overlap; they have to study many of the same phenomena but from different points of view. The sociologist proper stops at the fact, without establishing the motive, even if it can be established; the social psychologist studies the fact in order to throw light upon the motive that lies behind it. The sociologist is concerned with the social consequences which follow from the behaviour of numbers of individuals who are, in some respect, similarly placed; the social psychologist has to do rather with the causes that lead to the observed statistical regularities in social behaviour—or of course to irregularities, where they appear....

... Social psychology involves even more, the study of committees and associations of every sort and kind, of the behaviour of officials acting in their official

[1] *Politics and Letters*, Winter-Spring, 1947, Vols. 2 and 3, pp. 84-92.

capacities, of fathers or of housewives acting as representatives of families or of households, of Members of Parliaments, Town Councils, Soviets, Churches, Trade Unions and Co-operative Societies, and of the informal associations which arise among neighbours, among fellow-nationals, or on a still wider scale in international groupings. All these fields, despite some pioneering work (Graham Wallas, Robert Michels, Tonnies, Miss Follett, for example) remain mainly unexplored, and constitute the true sphere of Social Psychology as a study closely cognate to Sociology, but distinct from it because the centre of attention is in the sources of individuals' behaviour rather than in the mass results which ensue. . . ."

Up to this point, we have considered matters concerning people in all countries. Professor Cole discloses to British readers important facts about instruction and research in their own universities. He records chiefly sins of omission; not of commission. Yet it is fair to ask why Great Britain is resistant to the acceptance of Sociology; whether politics and economics can long continue to exist as separate and independent studies, each with its own laws, and whether it would not be wise to make certain changes, if we are to take the new Science of Man seriously, and not to lag behind our American colleagues.

There should be much more co-operation between anthropologists, sociologists, political scientists, economists and psychologists; sectionalism has already gone too far. The functions of different university departments and sub-departments might benefit by serious consideration of their usefulness in 1948.

KING JOHN AND THE PAPAL INTERDICT.[1]

By C. R. CHENEY, M.A. (Oxon.),
PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

ON Sunday 23rd March, 1208, an Interdict was pronounced in England and Wales, with the effect that these lands lay under the ban of the Church from the Monday next following for more than six years, until 2nd July, 1214.[2] This fact—that there was a prolonged ecclesiastical strike in England—is a schoolboy's commonplace. And although this particular Interdict has not been the subject of any special monograph, all scholars who have written about the reign of King John have had to discuss it.[3] Yet it remains amazingly obscure. Even in stating the precise date of its beginning, I am at variance with some of the pundits, and if we proceed to enquire into the terms of the Interdict, its application, the king's counterstrokes, the effect on popular opinion, we immediately run into darkness and contradictions. It is down this dark path that I wish to go exploring this afternoon; I can do no more than assemble, at

[1] A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 14th of April, 1948.

[2] There are numerous independent witnesses to the fact that the Interdict began on Monday, but the solemn pronouncement could only be effectively published on a Sunday, when all churchgoers would hear it, and publication on Sunday would explain the date given by several chroniclers (*Memoriale Fr. Walteri de Coventria* (Rolls series), ii. 199, *Annales monastici* (Rolls series), i. 29 iii. 30; F. Liebermann, *Ungedruckte anglo-normann. Geschichtsquellen* (1879), pp. 146, 168). The Winchcomb annals in Cottonian MS. Faustina B. i (fo. 24 r) say 'Veniente igitur dominica qua cantatur officium *Iudica me deus*, iubentur omnes sacerdotes per Angliam accensis candelis pulsatis campanis omnes excommunicare qui in personas ecclesiasticas vel res aut possessiones earum manus violentas inicere presumerent. Igitur per totam Angliam et Walliam interdictum feria secunda subsequenti districtissime observatur.' It may be noted that in accordance with liturgical usage a ban pronounced for Monday might take effect on Sunday evening after vespers.

[3] The most elaborate essay is that of J. Armitage Robinson, on 'Bishop Jocelin and the Interdict', *Somerset Historical Essays* (1921), pp. 141-159; and the best general survey is in the admirable pages devoted to the Interdict by Sir Maurice Powicke in *Cambridge Med. Hist.*, vi. (1929), 233-237.

various points along the track, a few illuminating facts, many of them familiar, a few of them less well known.

Let us begin with the one feature which stands out clearly: the cause of the Interdict. The archbishop of Canterbury had died in July, 1205. The monks who had to choose his successor had made two irregular elections and then, in December 1206, under papal guidance, elected Stephen Langton at Rome.[1] Pope Innocent III consecrated Langton as archbishop; but John would have none of him, refusing to confirm the election or let Langton enter England. He maintained that Langton was unfit to be archbishop and that, in accordance with the approved English custom, the king's consent to Langton's election should have preceded consecration. The pope entreated and then threatened: he demanded unconditional surrender. John hardened his heart and the pope's delegates laid the Interdict on England as punishment for the king's resistance.

An interdict constituted a serious disturbance of the normal life of the Church. Why, then, did the ecclesiastical authorities impose interdicts? They were, after all, not uncommon. Innocent III had already been responsible for an interdict on the kingdom of Leon which lasted from 1198 to 1204,[2] for interdicts on Normandy and on the kingdom of France in 1199,[3] for another interdict on France in 1200[4] and another on Normandy in 1203.[5] Besides papal sentences, there were countless interdicts imposed on smaller areas by bishops. From the eleventh century onwards, when the local interdict was clearly distinguished from personal forms of ecclesiastical censure, it had been applied to all sorts of infringements of ecclesiastical rights, whether committed by laymen or clergy.[6] Men recog-

[1] The only good account of these elections is by Professor David Knowles, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, liii. (1938), 211-220.

[2] E. B. Krehbiel, *The Interdict, its History and its Operation* (American Hist. Assoc., 1909), pp. 104-106.

[3] Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica* (Rolls series), iv. 94.

[4] A. Cartellieri, *Philipp II August*, IV. i (1921), 27-33.

[5] F. M. Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy* (1913), p. 248.

[6] An excellent discussion of interdicts in general will be found in P. Hinschius, *System des kathol. Kirchenrechts*, vols. iv and v (1888, 1895). W. Richter, *De origine et evolutione interdicti* (Textus et documenta: series theol. 12 and 13; Pontificia Universitas, Rome, 1934) is a useful collection of early texts.

nized that it weighed on the innocent as well as on the guilty, but this very fact made it more effective. For the interdict not merely deprived the guilty of spiritual consolations, it was designed to make the innocent sufferers hostile to the guilty party. By the time of Innocent III it was a diplomatic weapon, and the pope used it as a diplomatic weapon when he ordered that it be imposed on England. Doubtless he hoped for an immediate result: the acceptance of Langton by King John. In fact, he misjudged his adversary. John treated the Interdict as tantamount to a declaration of war, and war between king and pope, *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, continued for five years before an armistice was made in May 1213. Even then the Interdict, the occasion of the war, could not be lifted. The different interests of the pope, who had gained a vassal by the armistice, and of the English clergy, who had suffered heavy material losses during the preceding five years, confused and prolonged negotiations for more than a twelve-month.

The time of the Interdict may be regarded, then, not merely as a period when England was subject to a peculiar kind of ecclesiastical censure, but as a period of war between pope and king. As in many medieval wars, hostilities did not prevent constant efforts from both sides to negotiate a peace, nor should we describe it as 'total war'; but war it was. It follows that, if we would measure the effects of the Interdict on England, we must look not only at its terms and its application, but also at the king's retaliatory measures. The two aspects of the matter are brought out by Giraldus Cambrensis when he speaks of the Interdict as a double wound involving both the withdrawal of divine service and the plundering of the clergy's possessions.[1]

The first question is: what was involved in the withdrawal of divine service? The pope's original instructions to the three bishops who were told to promulgate the sentence were brief. The bishops were to permit no church-service (*officium*) to be celebrated in England except the baptism of children and the penance of the dying.[2] Everyone understood this to exclude in

[1] *Opera* (Rolls series), viii. 311.

[2] Migne, *Patrologia latina*, ccxv. 1210. Also in Gervase of Canterbury, *Hist. works* (Rolls series), ii. p. lxxviii.

general all celebration of the mass, all marriage-services and burial-services; but there was plenty of room left for doubt. For instance, what was the position of the religious Orders with privileges which mitigated interdicts? How were infants to be baptized with chrism, if chrism was not to be consecrated?[1] There was as yet no common law of interdicts; and it is curious to observe that, despite Pope Innocent III's great reputation as a lawyer, he allowed his draftsmen repeatedly to draw up mandates for interdicts which the administrators of those interdicts found to be insufficient. Time after time, prelates of France, of England, of Italy, have to write to the pope for interpretations or amplifications of an earlier papal mandate.[2] The prevailing uncertainty in this particular case is reflected in the ambiguity and contradictions of the records which have come down to us. The two fullest surviving mandates for the application of the interdict are both of doubtful authority. The first is a *Forma interdicti*, printed in the eighteenth century from a manuscript at Mont-St-Michel, which may have emanated from one or all of the bishop-executors.[3] Our second source, not in all respects compatible with the first, is an interpolated version of Innocent III's supplementary instructions of 14th June, 1208;[4] who composed it we cannot guess. These point to divergent practices in different parts of the country. The annals of Dunstable, which probably represent the practice in the diocese of Lincoln, give another not wholly identical picture.[5] While the *Forma interdicti* provides that children should be baptized at home, our second source provides for baptism within the church, behind closed doors, and this harmonizes with the practice reported by the annalist of Dunstable. The exclusion of laity from the churches seems, indeed, to have been variously applied. According to the *Forma*, no layman might enter unless he were some influential person who was not excommunicate and devoutly sought admittance and could not be refused without evil

[1] Migne, ccxv. 1423.

[2] Cf. Krehbiel, pp. 116-117; Migne, ccxv. 1423, 1582; *Decretales*, V. 38, 11.

[3] E. Martène and U. Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* (1717), i. 812, reprinted, Migne, ccxvii. 190.

[4] Gervase of Canterbury, ii. p. xcii.

[5] *Annales monastici*, iii. 30.

consequences : such a person might be admitted simply to hear a sermon. On the other hand, the Dunstable annalist says that priests granted access to the altars to those who wished to make offerings. In one place the priest might be advised not to distribute *panis benedictus* or holy water ; elsewhere he might receive contrary instructions. An unpublished letter of Peter of Blois, archdeacon of London, shows that the bishop of Salisbury looked to the chapter of St. Paul's for guidance and that in some particulars the advice he received left discretion to the parish-priests themselves.[1] Peter of Blois knew of a letter which Innocent III had written on another occasion to the bishop of Paris, mitigating the severity of an interdict, but he did not know whether the pope intended this to apply to England.[2] Again, although Innocent III, in 1209, told the bishop of Ferrara that baptized children might be confirmed, no such decision is known to have reached England, and we do not know how the English Church acted in this matter.

Early in 1209 the pope permitted conventual churches to celebrate mass once a week behind closed doors ;[3] but, again, his brief mandate left much unexplained, including the precise meaning of ' conventual church '. Peter of Blois proceeded to put to the bishop of London no less than eight separate questions on the matter. Late in 1212[4] a further mitigation of the Interdict's hard terms was granted : the *viaticum*, or last communion, was to be permitted to the dying. But still the terms were hard. Most people were still deprived of all sacraments save baptism and *viaticum*, and were confronted everywhere with closed and silent churches. Nobody at all was permitted Christian burial

[1] The two letters of Peter of Blois cited in this paper are contained in the Erfurt Amplonian MS. F. 71 fos. 194v, 196r. I am indebted to Mr. R. W. Southern, who discovered them, for transcripts.

[2] It is in *Decretales*, V. 38, 11 without address. Peter probably knew it in the collection of Alanus (V. 20, 1) where it is addressed to the bishop of Paris (*Ztsch. Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, Kanon. Abt. xxix (1940), 301-302).

[3] Migne, ccxv. 1529 and Gervase, ii. p. xcvii.

[4] Probably after 1st July, 1212, when Mauger, bishop of Worcester, died, since the permission was communicated by the bishops of Ely and London (Rad. de Coggeshall *Chronicon* (Rolls series), p. 165). The Reverend T. M. Parker tries unsuccessfully to connect this with Innocent's letter of 14th June, 1208 (' The terms of the Interdict of Innocent III ', *Speculum*, xi (1936), 260).

until the Interdict was lifted in July 1214. So far as can be seen, the clergy obediently observed what they believed to be the terms of the Interdict. The Cistercians, it is true, maintained, until called to order by the pope, that their privileges exempted them ; but this may have been due to a genuine misunderstanding. While there may have been some grumbling at the policy the pope had adopted—for this is hinted at by Matthew of Rievaulx [1]—we hear of no large-scale evasion of the interdict, as occurred in France in 1200 and in London in 1216.[2] Positive evidence is admittedly scanty ; there are, however, records from several monasteries and from the city of London of the setting aside of special unconsecrated ground for cemeteries.[3] Bishops who died in England during the Interdict are recorded as having shared the common fate in this respect. Ralph of Shrewsbury, bishop of Bangor, was buried at his own request in Shrewsbury market-place in 1213.[4]

This was the pope's way of waging war. Now let us look at the other side. King John's immediate reaction to the Interdict remains unknown, for his orders were conveyed to the county-courts by word of mouth. We cannot attach much importance to Roger Wendover's picturesque account of the king's passionate outburst against the bishop-executors, of his threat to slit the noses and tear out the eyes of all Italians and papal clerks in

[1] A. Wilmart, 'Les mélanges de Mathieu préchantre de Rievaulx', *Revue Bénédictine*, lii (1940), 83 : 'Ceterum non bene sapit quisquis ex nostris precipitanter et insolenter derogat et diiudicat actus apostolici. Non etenim expedit os in celum ponere et de huiusmodi loqui'. Stephen Langton administered a similar rebuke to critics in the sermon he preached at St. Paul's on 25th August, 1213 : 'Vos enim cum sitis laici, vestros prelatos tales esse debetis credere ut omnia discrete agant et cum consilio. Dominus papa christianitatis dominus est et ei oportet obedire.' (G. Lacombe, 'An unpublished document on the Great Interdict, 1207-13 (*sic*)', *Catholic Hist. Rev.*, xv (1929-1930), 417).

[2] Cartellieri, *op. cit.*, IV. i. 30-31 ; Matthew Paris *Chron. maiora* (Rolls series), ii 644-645. We cannot be sure how it was observed in Wales. Cf. Cheney, 'Alleged deposition of King John', in *Studies in mediæval history presented to F. M. Powicke* (1948), pp. 103-4, 115-6.

[3] Liebermann, *op. cit.*, p. 172 (St. Albans) ; *Chron. abbatiae de Melsa* (Rolls series), i. 351 (Meaux) ; Krehbiel, *op. cit.*, p. 61 (St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, and London). Cf. *Book of Fees*, i. 197.

[4] *Annales monastici*, ii. 273 ; *Hist. dunelmensis scriptores tres* (Surtees Soc.), p. 26 ; H. Wharton, *Anglia sacra* (1691), ii. 347.

England, of his amnesty to a highwayman who had killed a priest; but there is nothing incredible in it. Two of the bishops certainly left the country in a hurry, and the third, Mauger of Worcester, disappears from John's court early in the month of May. Some luckless Roman moneylenders had their property seized and were themselves turned out of the country.[1] It is not impossible that John pardoned some violence to the clergy, for he was a cruel and capricious man. But here the evidence is contradictory; for while we have a royal precept, dated 11th April, 1208, which expressly forbids action against monks or clergy, the *Annales londinienses*, of the early fourteenth century, which show a particular interest in legal procedure, say that during the Interdict the king ordered that no coroner in England should hold enquiries into the murder of clerks, in consequence of which many clerks perished.[2] John, abbot of Ford, writing in 1210, implies that the clergy had to fear personal violence as well as loss of property.[3] 'Benefit of clergy' was generally respected. During the Interdict felonous clerks were handed over to the church courts as before, and the recorded infringements of privilege are few. There was the famous case at Oxford in 1209 which caused the dispersal of the University. Two other cases, of Master Honorius, archdeacon of Richmond, and Geoffrey of Norwich, are examples of the arbitrary imprisonment without trial of persons whom the king may have suspected of treason.[4]

John chiefly adopted what we may call 'economic sanctions' to dissuade the English clergy from obeying the pope. On 18th March, 1208, he sent letters to the bishoprics of Lincoln and Ely to say that royal custodians would take into their hands on Monday, 24th March all the lands and goods of abbots and

[1] *Chron. abb. de Evesham* (Rolls series), p. 225.

[2] *Rotuli litt. clausarum* (Rec. Comm.), i. 111*a* (and in *Foedera* (Rec. Comm.), I. i. 101); *Chron. of Edward I and II* (Rolls series), i. 8.

[3] Balliol Coll. MS. 24, containing the sermons of John of Ford, has two sermons (no. 41 fo. 99r and no. 76 fo. 173v) which bear on the Interdict, written respectively in 1210 and 1212. I am obliged to Professor R. A. B. Mynors for indicating these writings to me, and to the Librarian of Balliol for furnishing photographs of them.

[4] *Rot. litt. claus.*, i. 115*a*; Liebermann, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

priors and all religious and clergy of these dioceses who would not celebrate divine service.[1] We may safely assume that orders of this sort covered the whole country. The monastic chroniclers almost all speak of a general seizure or confiscation of ecclesiastical property at this juncture. The work may have been left in some part to the sheriffs, but generally special custodians were detailed to take possession of both the landed property and the movables of the clergy. John can hardly have found enough officials to do more than supervise the performance of this enormous task. It involved the substitution of new personnel for the monastic obedientiaries in charge of estates and the appointment of controllers for the sale of the clergy's farm-produce and the provision of their daily bread. This work was entrusted to local men. 'Four legal men' of each parish or vill were appointed to assess the maintenance-allowance or 'estovers' of the clergy, and they, it seems, actually took possession of the clergy's barns in the king's name and administered the supplies which were contained there.[2] It was a thankless (and presumably unpaid) task. The men fell under sentence of excommunication for laying hands on ecclesiastical property, and had to render account to royal officials.[3] The letter written by Peter of Blois early in 1209, to which reference has been made, discusses the circumstances in which absolution might be given to 'the groups of four villagers (*rustici*) wickedly standing guard over the clergy's barns'. Opinion in the chapter of St. Paul's was divided, he says, 'but we are agreed in this, that if any of them come to your eminence [the bishop of Salisbury] in a state of penitence and devotion and humbly seek absolution, he might be absolved . . . Doubtless such as these ought to be brought into the embrace of the Church, for so long as the Church militant endures, there may be found sheep and goats in Jacob's flock, good fish and bad in Peter's net, thorns and lilies in the garden of Abraham.' Ralph Niger, in one of the few passages on these years where his chronicle adds to the printed chronicle

[1] *Rot. litt. patentium* (Rec. Comm.), p. 80*b*, cf. p. 80*a*.

[2] *Gesta abbatum S. Albani* (Rolls series), i. 236; *Annales monastici*, ii. 260-261; *Rot. litt. claus.*, i. 109*b*, 111*b*. I cannot subscribe to Professor A. B. White's interpretation of the procedure (*American Hist. Rev.*, xvii (1911-1912), 12-16).

[3] Migne, ccxvii. 191-192; *Annales monastici*, ii. 261.

of Coggeshall tells us that in 1209 ' the four men of each vill who last year had taken charge of the clergy's movables by the king's command were now called upon miserably to answer for their stewardship '.[1]

It is not easy to estimate all the implications of this measure. There are few detailed instructions to show how it was applied, no reports or accounts of custodians, no record (save in comparatively few cases) of how and when the king relaxed his hold. Both the Close Rolls and Fine Rolls of chancery are missing for the tenth and subsequent years of King John, and the other classes of chancery and household records are fragmentary for the period of the Interdict.[2] The Pipe Rolls of the exchequer are almost silent on the matter. Yet it deserves investigation. If this measure was widely applied for five years (until the king made submission to the pope) it must have brought great wealth to the king and at the same time strained his administrative staff to the uttermost. It must have been a constant irritation to the clergy and must have limited their activity in various directions. Actually, the royal policy seems to have changed. The first confiscation was general. But very soon, in many cases within a few weeks, the king relinquished control of much of the Church's property. Although, in these cases, he restored administration of the property but not its profits, he may in fact have abandoned both. The evidence is scrappy and cannot be analysed in the course of a single lecture, but it points in this direction. Certainly, if John continued for five years to take the revenues of the bulk of the clergy and the monasteries, it is hard to explain the silence of the records. The royal receipts from this source might, indeed, have gone to swell the resources of the *camera regis* without being accounted for at the exchequer ;[3] but the

[1] British Museum, Royal MS. A. xii fo. 89r. Niger records a second seizure of the clergy's crops in 1209 (*ibid.*) ; cf. *Ann. mon.*, ii. 264.

[2] The Close Rolls begin again on 3rd May, 1212, the Fine Rolls a year later. The Charter and Patent Rolls are missing from May 1209 to May 1212. The only Misae Rolls run from May 1209 to May 1210 and from May 1212 to May 1213.

[3] Cf. Pipe Roll 10 John (Pipe Roll Soc., n. s. 23, 1947), p. xii. But the renders to the chamber recorded in the next Pipe Roll all concern ecclesiastical property which was in the king's hand by reason of vacancies. P.R.O., Pipe Roll 11 John rot. 1 m. 2 (Chichester), rot. 6 m. 2d. (Lincoln), rot. 8 m. 1d. (Exeter).

chancery records of 1212 and 1213, the returns of sheriffs in 1212, and the papal correspondence seem only to be concerned with the property of the exiles. According to Adam of Eynsham, who wrote his life of St. Hugh of Lincoln during the Interdict, almost all the rectors of England redeemed their property.[1] The many who accepted confiscation passively during the first few weeks of the Interdict may well have groaned under their custodians as weeks lengthened into months and years; and as the prospects of peace receded they may have fined with the king to regain control of their property.

Adam of Eynsham's remark about the rectors of England was intended to present a contrast with the noble self-denial of Raymond, archdeacon of Leicester, who preferred to go into exile and forfeit his revenues. The king's animosity, in fact, was directed against those who fled, not those who stayed. It is indeed possible that he presented the clergy with the plain alternative of redeeming their confiscated property or forfeiting it by flight. (In 1210 he set about the tallaging of the Jews by a somewhat similar method.) Many undoubtedly fled, especially after the excommunication of the king in November 1209. Early in 1211 John ordered (if the Waverley annalist can be trusted) 'that all bishops and clergy with revenues in England and dwelling abroad should return within a fortnight of the feast of St. John the Baptist, or be deprived of their revenues in England'.[2] A year later (5th June, 1212) the king ordered the seizure of all churches and revenues of clerks who had been instituted by the authority of the exiled prelates, and the expulsion of the persons so instituted.[3] The returns of the sheriffs

[1] *Magna vita S. Hugonis* (Rolls series), pp. 303-304.

[2] *Ann. mon.*, ii. 266. Coggeshall (p. 164) says that the exiles 'vocitantur . . . per edictum publicum in vicecomitatibus'. This suggests the process of outlawry which John renounced at his submission in 1213 (Rot. litt. pat., p. 100*a* and *b*). It may have been as a result of this action that the Pipe Roll 14 John (1211-1212) includes in the account of the bishopric of Lincoln '£92 8s. 8d. de exitibus ecclesiarum que fuerunt hoc anno in manu regis unde nomina et particule sunt in rotulo qui est in thesauro' (rot. 1 m. 1); also under York, '£308 7s. 2½d. de ecclesiis et prebendis archiepiscopatus existentibus in manu regis' (*ibid.*); also under Bath, '£85 7s. 3d. de exitibus ecclesiarum et prebendarum' (rot. 1 m. 1d).

[3] *Rot. litt. claus.*, 1. 130*b*. The editor of the *Book of fees*, i. 53, failing to note the official enrolment, quotes Wendover's slightly garbled version. Cf. *Ann. mon.*, iii. 33.

to the king's writ have only survived for five counties. They record institutions to the deanery of Wells, the archdeaconry of Bath, and only nine parishes.[1] The returns do not generally state what action has been taken to seize the property or expel the parsons, but in two cases the execution of the writ had apparently been anticipated. First, 'Elias', to whom the bishop of Lincoln had given the church of Sleaford, was 'overseas and the church has been seized into the king's hand by the servants of Brian de Lisle'.[2] Secondly, the bishop of Bath had given the deanery of Wells to Master Ralph of Lechlade, 'but it is in the lord king's hand'.[3] These were now the objects of the king's displeasure, and it was for them that special provision was made in the armistice terms of May, 1213.

The dramatic confiscation of property in March 1208 was only applied to a limited extent. All sections of the clergy, nevertheless, were obliged to pay large sums to the king during the Interdict. We may take it that they normally recovered possession of their property on paying a fine; in the case of St. Albans, this amounted to 600 marks, with a *donum* of 500 marks into the bargain.[4] Besides this, the clergy was taxed. In the year 1211 the secular clergy of the Northern province paid more than £3,700 as gifts (*dona*), and the monasteries (especially the Cistercians) were very heavily mulcted.[5] Finally, bishoprics and monasteries were left vacant for years on end so that the Crown might enjoy their revenues. By May 1213 there were seven vacant bishoprics and dozens of abbeys without abbots. But these two last sources of royal income, *dona* and vacancies,

[1] *Book of fees* (H.M.S.O., 1920-1931), i. 70, 81, 141, 149, 197.

[2] *Ibid.*, i. 197.

[3] *Ibid.*, i. 82. This fact gives a fact in the career of Ralph of Lechlade unnoticed by Armitage Robinson, *Somerset Hist. Essays*, p. 188. Ralph had been precentor, and is said to appear as dean in 1217 (*ibid.* and Le Neve, *Fasti*, i. 150), but can this be substantiated? He was not dean between 30th Sept., 1213 and 11th July, 1215 (Hist. MSS. Comm. *Report on . . . Wells*, i (1907), 53, 67, 490), when Leonius was dean. Ralph acted as dean when overseas with Bishop Jocelin (*ibid.*, i. 58) and he was probably abroad in March 1213 (*Rot. litt. claus.*, i. 128*b*).

[4] *Gesta abbatum S. Albani*, i. 241-243.

[5] S. K. Mitchell, *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III* (Yale, 1914), pp. 106-108.

should not strictly be placed to the account of the Interdict. They were only incidentally part of the king's reaction to the pope's anathemas. English kings (John included) had not needed the stimulus of an interdict to make money from vacancies deliberately prolonged. In 1203 Innocent III had complained to King John that he was preventing an election to the wealthy see of Lincoln in order to enjoy the revenues the longer.[1] *Dona* were demanded from the clergy in 1199, 1203, 1204, and 1205; taxation of the clergy in a more formal way began with the income-tax of 1207, and was soon to lose all air of novelty. The chronicles of the time and modern historians have tended to represent all these measures too exclusively as the depredations of a king at war with the Church rather than as the financial devices of a ruthless fiscal expert.

One 'economic sanction' applied by the king is in line with other indications which point to a certain roguish humour in John's temperament. He gave orders, we are told, to the officials charged with confiscating the clergy's goods, that they were to lock up the mistresses, housekeepers, and lady-loves (*amasiae*) of priests and clerks and hold them to ransom.[2] It was a piquant stroke at ecclesiastical authority. The clergy's womenfolk caused a scandal which the canon law denounced but which disciplinarians had long rebuked in vain. The king now traded on the ill-success of the Church in controlling its ministers, and contrived to do so without infringing clerical immunity. Abbot John of Ford, preaching in 1210, condemns those priests who account this privation the worst feature of the Interdict, and who hasten to devote the churches' revenues to the ransom of their mistresses.[3] How much this action profited the Crown we cannot say. The Pipe Roll of 13 John shows that Hugh de Nevill was to be charged with receipts 'de sacerdotissis et rebus clericorum'.[4]

[1] Migne, ccxiv. 1176.

[2] *Ann. mon.*, ii. 261. The Bury annalist, Wendover, Coldingham, and Niger also report this action.

[3] Balliol Coll. MS. 24 fo. 100r.

[4] P.R.O., Pipe Roll 13 John, rot. 14 m. 2. No sum is stated, but the corresponding entry next year gives it as 100 marks (Pipe Roll 14 John, rot. 16m. 2d.). This sum was still outstanding in 1215 (Pipe Roll 17 John, rot. 5 m.2).

I have suggested that John treated the Interdict as a declaration of war. But his war was against the pope, not against the English Church or the Christian religion. His economic sanctions and his threats of violence were designed to discourage the English clergy from obeying the pope, not to wreck the ecclesiastical system in England. The king himself, whether or no he had earned his reputation for impiety, continued active in devotional works and promoted Christian piety among his subjects. His excommunication in 1209 made no difference. Not only do the exchequer records show that the regular accounts of 'elemosine constitute'—royal subscriptions for charitable purposes—continued as before. We also find in 1212 a long list of fresh gifts to religious houses.[1] Although the king regularly neglected the fasts enjoined by the Church, his household accounts were as regularly charged with the expense of his penance: a hundred poor people were fed at Tewkesbury on 31st July, 1212, at a cost of 9s. 4½d, because the king had eaten twice on the preceding Friday at Ludgershall, and so on many more occasions.[2] The household accounts contain more convincing evidence of the king's observance of religious propriety in expenditure during 1212 on candles to be set upon coffers of relics.[3] In the same year sumpter-horses were hired and bought to carry relics in the king's train, and he visited the relics of St. James at Reading Abbey (in which he had always taken special interest). On Good Friday, 1213 the king made his offering of 13d. at the Cross; and, what is more, paid 8d. for the knights who offered with him.[4] Thus he advertised his orthodoxy, though excommunicate.

In view of this, we need not be surprised that the everyday administration of the Church was allowed to proceed as usual. Within the last twenty years the publication of the Curia Regis Rolls has enabled us to see more clearly how the king's court dealt with the clergy. When the Interdict began, the curia regis sometimes postponed a suit *sine die* because one of the litigants

[1] *Rot. litt. claus.*, i. 123b. Cf. H. Cole, *Documents illustrative of English History* (1844), pp. 233-234, 240, 247.

[2] Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 236, cf. *ibid.*, 231-235, etc. and *Rotuli de liberate ac de misis et prestitis* (Rec. Comm.), pp. 110-111, 117, 120, 122, 136, etc.

[3] Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 231, 233, 246, 258 (cf. *Pipe Roll 2 John*, p. xviii).

was a religious house whose property was in the king's hand; but it did not do so always. After the summer of 1208 the plea was not admitted as a cause of postponement.[1] The clergy, secular and religious, continually appear in court as plaintiffs and defendants in disputes over advowsons and landed property. Final concords concerning them are continually executed at Westminster and at assizes in the shires. Nowhere is there the least suggestion that the scales are weighted against an ecclesiastical litigant. The chroniclers of Worcester, Dunstable, and Peterborough, each reports a successful lawsuit in which his house engaged during the Interdict.[2] The honorial courts of bishops and abbeys (through their custodians) successfully contest the jurisdiction of the king's court in several cases.[3]

It is never easy in the early thirteenth century to find out how the church courts worked, but so far as we can see their work was not interrupted by the Interdict. The king's court hears of cases which have been improperly called into the court christian, and allows felonous clerks to be removed to the court christian. On one occasion, Aubrey de Vere, earl of Oxford, is told not to impede the process of a tithe-case before the archdeacon of Colchester.[4] But this freedom was seriously restricted in one respect. In 1210 (if we may believe the chroniclers)[5] John forbade the hearing of ecclesiastical law-suits on the authority of papal mandates. The cessation of papal jurisdiction is confirmed by the record of several cases which show otherwise inexplicable delay. For instance, a papal commission to judges delegate dated 20th May, 1210, is recorded in a report by the judges in 1216, and a commission of 28th July, 1210, leads to a judgment late in 1214 or after. A composition reached in October 1214 is based

[1] The only case between Trinity Term 1208 and the end of the Interdict concerns the abbot of Waverley, in Michaelmas Term 1210, and then a later day was appointed 'because it is not known whether the abbey is in the lord king's hand or not' (*Curia Regis Rolls*, vi. 69). This was an exceptional occasion, when the heavy taxation of the Cistercians had led to the temporary dispersal of the convent and the flight of the abbot (*Ann. mon.*, ii. 265). And the case went on.

[2] *Ann. mon.* iii. 33, iv. 397; *Hist. Anglicanae scriptores varii*, ed. J. Sparke (1723), ii. 106.

[3] *Curia Regis Rolls*, v. 317, vi. 8, 206.

[4] *Rot. litt. claus.*, i. 124*a*.

[5] *Ann. mon.*, iii. 33, iv. 54; Walter of Coventry, ii. 202.

on a mandate dated 30th November, 1212.[1] Other papal commissions survive from 1209, 1210 and 1212, but there is no indication of the date at which they were executed, and they are strikingly few in number.[2] Moreover, there is no evidence that English suitors carried their cases to Rome during this period. By a letter dated 29th October, 1210, Innocent III stopped a case until the storm in the English Church should have ceased.[3]

Apart from litigation, a good deal of routine business had to be done. Vacancies on the episcopal bench had to be filled; and although the king was frequently obstructive, he did not impose a veto on all elections. Following papal letters of January 1209, elections took place at Chichester, Exeter, Lichfield, and Lincoln.[4] Throughout the Interdict, rectors and vicars were instituted in livings, and we hear of nuns receiving solemn benediction, religious houses entering into confraternity. The prebend of Ogbourne was created in the church of Salisbury in May 1208, and a vicarage was established in the Sussex church of Henfield in 1209.[5] In 1210-1211 Peter FitzHerbert arranged

[1] *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1817-1830), VI.ii. 908; Hist. MSS. Comm. *Report on MSS. of Duke of Rutland*, iv. 33 and *Cartulary of Darley Abbey*, ed. R. R. Darlington, ii. 439-440 (cf. *Rot. litt. pat.*, p. 125*ab*); Westminster, Dean and Chapter muniments, 15684. A writ of prohibition was issued in 1210 or 1211, probably directed to judges delegate of the pope: 'Stephanus de Ebroic' debet vi canes de mota pro habendo precepto regis ad abbatem de Evesham et priorem (*sic*) de Davintr' et de Ely ne procedant in loquela' (Pipe Roll 13 John, rot. 12 m. 2d.).

[2] *Coucher Book of Kirkstall Abbey* (Thoresby Soc.), p. 254 (Nov. 2nd, 1209); Migne, ccxvi. 374 (Dec. 13th, 1210); Westminster, muniments, 2596 (17th Dec., 1210); *Cartulary of St. Frideswide's* (Oxford Hist. Soc.), ii. 50 (Apr. 25th, 1212); Hist. MSS. Comm. *Report on var. Collections*, iv. 64 (May 7th, 1212). A case which had lasted a long time (*diutius*) between St. Guthlac's, Hereford, and St. John's, Brecon, was settled by judges delegate on Apr. 9th, 1214 (*Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 4th series, xiv (1883), 26-27).

The statement of the Waverley annalist, *s.a.* 1207 (*Ann. mon.*, ii. 259): 'Facta est hoc anno prohibitio domini regis ne placita domini papae in Anglia teneantur' is probably misplaced. Cases were conducted in England on papal mandates in 1208 and 1209 (Brit. Mus., Cotton MS. Vesp. E. xx fos. 92 and 240, and Migne, ccxv. 1504); in the exchequer year ending Michaelmas 1209 Master John de Rammesbiri offered three palfreys to have royal letters to judges delegate ordering them to proceed in a case (Wm. Salt Soc. *Collections*, ii. 148, 154, 161; cf. *Curia Regis Rolls*, vi. 189).

[3] *Memorials of Fountains Abbey* (Surtees Soc.) i. 172.

[4] Migne, ccxv. 1528-1529; *Ann. mon.*, iii. 31, iv. 54.

[5] *Register of St. Osmund* (Rolls series), i. 189; *Victoria County Hist. Sussex*, ii. 7.

with Robert de Ros to divide between them the advowson of a Yorkshire church 'if it could be done with the archbishop's agreement'; if the archbishop would not give his assent, the two parties were to present alternately to the living.[1] The archbishop for whom this nice regard was shown was the exile, Geoffrey Plantagenet. We cannot assume (as is often done) that church-building was at a standstill. Dunstable Priory built a new almonry during 1208. In January 1209 the canons of Lincoln had the king's permission to transport without hindrance the timber and lead which they had bought for the work on their church. A little later we hear of appeals for repairs to the church of St. Mary and St. Chad at Lichfield, and for work on the church of St. Andrew's Northampton. In the same year the church of St. Mary Overey, Southwark, was rebuilt after the fire of 1207. These records all belong to the early part of the Interdict. But early in 1213 King John subscribed to building operations at Barlings, Beaulieu, and Romsey Abbeys.[2]

Scanty as our evidence is, it suggests that there was no deliberate obstruction of ecclesiastical business, with the important exception of appeals to Rome in and after 1210. This immediately raises the question: was business indirectly impeded by shortage of personnel? Were the exiled clergy so numerous and so important that their absence precluded sound administration? This is one of the hardest questions connected with the Interdict. For we can neither discover the names of all who left England, nor measure their importance. A few facts may, however, dispel a few illusions. As regards the episcopate,

[1] P.R.O., Pipe Roll 13 John, rot. 4 m.l: 'Petrus filius Hereberti reddit compotum de 500 marcis pro habenda alia medietate ville de Wichton' cum pertinentiis, ita quod capitale mesagium cum gardino remanebit predicto Petro sed faciet Roberto de Ros rationabile escambium mesagii illius de parte sua in eadem villa. Medietas autem advocationis ecclesie de Wichton' si fieri possit de assensu archiepiscopi remanebit predicto Roberto et alia medietas predicto Petro, et si de assensu archiepiscopi ita fieri non possit, predictus Robertus dabit ecclesiam illam cum vacaverit una vice et predictus Petrus alia vice'. Ecclesiastical authorities opposed this division of livings (cf. *Curia Regis Rolls*, ii. 211 and Council of Oxford (1222), c.xiii, Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 587).

[2] *Ann. mon.*, iii. 30, 451; *Rot. litt. pat.*, pp. 88*b*, 90*a*; Cole, *op. cit.*, pp. 251, 257. In the year ending Michaelmas 1212 he had spent no less than £354 2s. 7d. on work at Beaulieu, his own foundation (P.R.O., Pipe Roll 14 John, rot. 11 m.l).

none of the chroniclers is a safe guide. Until November 1209 the only absent diocesans out of a total of seventeen in England were the two primates and the bishops of Ely, Hereford, London, and Worcester. But the sees of Durham and Lichfield fell vacant during 1208, and Chichester, Exeter, Lichfield, and Lincoln were filled by bishops unconsecrated in November 1209. The excommunication of the king seems to have been a signal for further desertions: the bishops of Bath, Lincoln, Rochester, and Salisbury all went abroad. Thereafter, most of the episcopal bench were absent from England until the summer of 1213. This state of affairs was, beyond doubt, unhealthy; but it may not seriously have impaired the workings of diocesan government. Just as the government of England went on in the king's absence during the reigns of Richard I and John, so also in the dioceses of England administration had reached an impersonal stage where the diocesan's presence was not absolutely necessary. Archbishops Baldwin and Hubert can have spent comparatively little time in the personal conduct of diocesan business. Archbishop Geoffrey of York was absent from his see as often as he was present—and perhaps, in view of his fiery Plantagenet temper, that was just as well. The secular activities of bishops and long vacancies of sees had caused a great deal of diocesan business to devolve on the officials and the archdeacons. The *officialis* had emerged in most English bishoprics by the beginning of the thirteenth century—in time to take over during the Interdict all the routine work connected with the parochial clergy. He is constantly mentioned in royal letters of presentation. We have letters of the exiled Mauger, bishop of Worcester, to his two officials, Robert, prior of Worcester, and Master Robert of Clipston, in 1211,[1] and the notice of Langton's appointment of the prior of Worcester to be official after Mauger's death.[2]

Concerning cathedral dignitaries, regulars, and the inferior clergy, we cannot hope for the whole truth. Richard Poore, dean of Salisbury, and Raymond, archdeacon of Leicester, were at Paris during the Interdict. Benedict of Sansetun, precentor of St. Paul's, and Robert Grosseteste, may have been there

[1] Brit. Mus., Harl. MS. 3650 fo. 47v. Miss K. Major kindly drew my attention to these documents.

[2] *Ann. mon.*, iv. 401.

too.[1] Among those found abroad with the brothers Jocelin and Hugh, bishops of Bath and Lincoln, are the dean of Wells, several canons of Wells, and the celebrated Master Elias of Dereham.[2] In the early part of the Interdict Adam, monk of Eynsham, biographer of St. Hugh, visited France, but he was back in England in 1211 or 1212. We also find English monastic prelates in Ireland and Scotland, but we cannot assuredly count them among the exiles. The impression we gain is that the clerical exiles were comparatively few in number: some clerks who had incurred the king's displeasure, some who were men of unbending character and high principles, some scholars who could pursue their studies most satisfactorily abroad; they could be counted in dozens, not in hundreds. Their absence meant a diminution but no dearth of ecclesiastical lawyers and administrators in England. With the exception of Poore and Grosseteste and Sansetun, nearly all the bishops of the next generation seem to have lived under the Interdict in England, many of them as trusted servants of the king; they include Walter de Gray, the chancellor, Henry de Londres, Richard de Marisco, Simon of Apulia, William of Cornhill, Ranulf of Wareham, Walter Mauclerk, Eustace of Fauconberg, Geoffrey de Burgh. There were others, too, who, although they never reached the episcopate, held cathedral dignities and archdeaconries and had responsibilities as churchmen. One may name among them Master Roger of Rolveston, dean of Lincoln, William de Monte, chancellor of Lincoln, Peter of Blois, archdeacon of London, Thomas of Chabham, subdean of Salisbury, John of Brancaster, archdeacon of Worcester, Robert of Gloucester, archdeacon of Stafford, William of Wrotham, archdeacon of Taunton.

To sum up with a guarded opinion on this ill-recorded subject, we may say that ecclesiastical government was undoubtedly disturbed by the Interdict. There could be no appeals to Rome, and if synods and visitations could, theoretically, be held by the bishop's deputies, in fact they were less likely to occur,

[1] Benedict was in the schools at Paris when elected bishop of Rochester in Dec. 1214 (Wharton, *Anglia sacra*, ii. 386). Grosseteste suggests that he heard the exiled Langton in France (Matt. Paris, *Chronica maiora*, v. 404).

[2] J. A. Robinson, *Somerset Hist. Essays*, p. 154.

and we have no trace of them. In the notorious cases of the exempt abbeys of Evesham and Westminster much-needed disciplinary action had to await the coming of a papal legate. There was also the imponderable depressing effect of the Interdict itself and the fear of the king's tyranny, tending to produce pessimism and inertia in church government. The normal routine of diocesan administration went on, but at a somewhat reduced tempo.

This paper has already touched on enough doubtful matters, but before I close I shall make bold to raise a still more difficult question, which is also perhaps the most interesting of all: What was the effect of the Interdict on the religious life and practices of the people of England? Here again I can only offer a few shreds of information which cannot always be interpreted with confidence. Contemporary comment on the Interdict is for the most part the comment of monks, from their own special standpoint; not a single layman's opinion of these events is on record.

The first reaction of the people of England to the solemn pronouncement of the Interdict must have been confused by John's propaganda. The king anticipated the sentence by sending his agents to the shires to give his version of the dispute with Innocent III. In appealing to the custom of England, he had a plausible case, and never once admitted that he was wrong, until his submission in 1213. The laity, in so far as they thought about the matter, might be expected to take his side rather than adopt a high 'ultramontane' point of view. The clergy, too, were in a great measure the products of the system which the pope opposed, and there was room (if not so much room) for honest disagreement about the rights of the case as there was in the case of Becket, which had divided the English clergy a generation earlier. The Cistercian annalist of Margam Abbey makes the remarkable statement that all the laity, most of the clergy, and many religious were on the king's side at the outset of the dispute over the Canterbury election.[1] The Interdict, by

[1] *Ann. monastici*, i. 28: 'Pro cuius electione quia facta fuit contra profanas illas consuetudines, quas vocant avitas leges et regias libertates, orta est statim discordia inter Papam Innocentium et Iohannem tyrannum Angliae, faventibus

emphasizing a conflict of loyalties, must have bewildered many. When the king was excommunicated, matters became worse; many of his subjects now had to decide between ignoring the sentence and going into exile. The majority seems to have ignored the sentence. The lay magnates remain at court attesting the king's charters and participating in government, and although the clerical element in the royal circle is reduced, it still includes two bishops, two Cistercian abbots, various members of the two orders of the Temple and the Hospital, and a large number of secular clerks.

All this must have been demoralizing to the persons immediately concerned and to the onlookers. Their orthodoxy was tested in another way by the removal of the usual stimuli to devotion. In the margin of Matthew Paris' *Chronica maiora*, at the year 1208, is a drawing of a church-bell, with the bell-rope looped up so that it cannot be used.[1] The cessation of bell-ringing was a minor evil, but symbolic of the silence which had descended on the churches. Abbot John of Ford, in a sermon preached in 1210, remarks on the danger that Christian piety will expire if help is not brought by the Father of Mercies, because the sacrament of the Last Supper has been withdrawn. 'To a few of us' he says, 'by the mercy of God, is left a modicum of refreshment with the Bread of Life, but the masses have waited in continual fasting for nearly two years now, denied all participation in the sacraments. And there is no doubt that they will die on the road and completely cease to remember their fatherland if their hunger goes on increasing.'[2] The denial of the sacraments was a check upon religious devotion which was likely to have permanent results. Some ninety years later Pope Boniface VIII recognized that as a result of the denial of the sacraments during interdicts 'the indevotion of the populace grows, heresies pullulate, and infinite spiritual dangers arise'.[3]

ei et consentientibus omnibus laicis et clericis fere universis, sed et viris cuiuslibet professionis multis, sicut plenius habetur in quodam libello qui inscribitur *De symonia*.' I have failed to identify this book.

[1] Facsimile in M. R. James, 'The Drawings of Matthew Paris', *Walpole Soc. Publications*, xiv (1925-1926), pl. 7.

[2] Balliol Coll. MS. 24 fos. 99v, 101r.

[3] *Sext*, V. 11, 24.

The mitigation in favour of the conventual clergy (1209), to which Abbot John refers, by which they might celebrate mass once a week behind closed doors, caused scandal rather than comfort to the rest of the people, who saw in it unjust discrimination.[1] There was added the discouragement to men who wished to enter the priesthood; for they could not receive ordination in an interdicted land.

On the other hand, the local ecclesiastical authorities tried to keep alive religious practices which were not positively prohibited by papal mandate. Priests were exhorted to say their hours in private, to preach regularly to the people, to announce the feast-days, and open their church-doors to their parishioners on the patronal festivals. Confession was to be encouraged, although the penitent could not be given absolution (save *in articulo mortis*). On Good Friday, priests might set up, outside the church, a cross for the customary adoration of the parishioners.[2] At London there was no blessing of candles at Candlemas, but ashes were blessed in the chapter-house of St. Paul's on Ash Wednesday, 1209, for distribution to the canons and cathedral clergy.[3] In 1210 an attempt was made to kindle the Londoner's faith by the burning of a heretic, if we may believe the jejune and solitary record of the *Liber de antiquis legibus*.[4]

Adversity sometimes produces a state of mind favourable to religious observances. Some of those who took hardly the cessation of church-services, or who experienced the oppressiveness of John's arbitrary rule, regarded the Interdict as a divine judgment, an encouragement to works of penance. John of Ford expatiates on the wickedness of the clergy and concludes, 'What wonder if the hand of the Lord has been stretched out

[1] Peter of Blois writing to the bishop of London about March 1209, says: 'Primores nostre civitatis graviter scandalizantur et murmurant quod cum per episcopos et clericos sicud asserunt procuratum sit interdictum et ipsi ab hoc penitus sint immunes, clericis aliqua relaxatione gaudentibus illi sine causa remanent obligati.' Cf. Innocent III's letter to the Cistercians, Migne, ccxvi. 20.

[2] These details are from the sources mentioned above, p. 298, notes 3, 4, 5.

[3] From the letter of Peter of Blois to the bishop of Salisbury.

[4] *Liber de antiquis legibus*, ed. T. Stapleton (Camd. Soc.), p. 3: 'Hoc anno concrematus est quidam Ambigensis apud Londonias'. Maitland, *Roman canon law*, p. 161 accepts this story. Mr. H. G. Richardson remarks that the victim was 'presumably a foreign merchant'. *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, li (1936), 1.

against all these?' Matthew of Rievaulx, another Cistercian, attributes the Interdict to sin. He discusses the evil of lay influence on elections of prelates and says: 'This is the original reason and the definite apostacy which explains why the voice of the turtle-dove—that is, Mother Church—is not heard in our land. For this reason chiefly the Lord of Sabaoth has closed the mouths of those who praised him and abandoned us to scorn and derision, so that people and priesthood are deprived of sacred rites and sacrifices.'[1] Religious exercises were stimulated by these considerations. We need not be surprised if pilgrims flocked to the shrines of saints during the Interdict, and if signs and wonders ensued. (Whereas most churches remained shut, monastic churches which were frequently visited by pilgrims were told to admit visitors by a side door.[2]) The annalist of Waverley tells us that in 1211 one 'St. Simon was martyred in the Isle of Wight, and very soon miracles were worked at his tomb.'[3] In 1212 a miraculous cure at the tomb of St. Wulfstan brought to Worcester a substantial grant of land in Ireland.[4] At Eastertide in 1213 'the miracles of God and St. Frehemund, king and martyr, so increased in the church of Dunstable that the news of them spread far and wide and the people gave thanks abundantly.'[5] Giraldus Cambrensis, in his life of St. Hugh of Lincoln, gives a detailed account of five miracles worked at this saint's tomb during the Interdict and of another at Worksop Priory.[6] Many years afterwards, in 1228, when evidence was collected towards the canonization of St. Osmund of Salisbury, Master Thomas of Chabham and other witnesses told of two miraculous cures effected at Osmund's tomb in the old cathedral, which could not be adequately signalled and celebrated by the ringing of bells because of the General Interdict which lay on England at the time.[7] I do not wish to over-emphasize the significance of these incidents. They do, however, show that the normal expressions of religiosity were not lacking.

[1] *Revue Bénédictine*, lii. 83.

[2] Gervase of Canterbury, ii. p. xcii. cf. above, p. 298.

[3] *Ann. monastici*, ii. 266.

[4] *Ibid.*, iv. 401.

[5] *Ibid.*, iii. 39.

[6] *Opera* (Rolls series), vii. 137-147.

[7] A. R. Malden, *The canonization of St. Osmund* (Wilts Rec. Soc., 1901), pp. 37-8, 40.

The Interdict left a mark on English society which was not easily forgotten, particularly by the clergy. Did it fulfil its purpose? The clergy suffered material losses; the laity lacked in great measure the clergy's ministrations. But for five years King John—the sole object of the pope's displeasure—remained unmoved. In Stubbs's words, 'he grew richer and stronger as he grew more contumacious'.[1] When at last he submitted, his submission was a diplomatic move, prompted by fear of rebellion at home combined with invasion from abroad. These political circumstances may conceivably have been due in part to the Interdict, but this cannot be demonstrated. Still, Innocent III, by maintaining the Interdict for five years, had exhibited his tremendous authority over the English Church. He was able to go on enforcing this spiritual punishment until political circumstances led John to want a papal alliance; then the king accepted the terms which the pope had offered in 1211 and admitted Langton to the see of Canterbury. It was a considerable victory for the pope, but it was a victory without the prospect of peace. It did nothing to relax the tension which the conflicting claims of Church and State had created in medieval society.

[1] *Constit. Hist. of England*, ch. xii. § 153.

AN ARTHURIAN MANUSCRIPT IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.[1]

By CEDRIC E. PICKFORD, M.A.

AMONG the French manuscripts in the John Rylands Library there is an interesting copy of part of the Old French Arthurian Cycle. The only account of this manuscript which at present exists is the rather summary description in the "Hand-List of French and Italian Manuscripts",[2] and an examination has shown that it merits greater attention. French MS. No. 1 consists of two large folio volumes which contain the second part of the *Livre de Lancelot del Lac* (ff. 1-181 v°.), *La Queste del Saint Graal* (ff. 182-211 v°.), and *La Mort al Roi Artus* (ff. 212-257 v°.); that is, it represents the second part of the Vulgate Arthurian Cycle. The two volumes comprise 257 vellum leaves; the first 129 plus iv (paper), and the second 128 plus iv (paper). This division into volumes is purely artificial and does not correspond to any division in the work. The manuscript measures 411 × 292 mm. in its bindings, the leaves being 398 × 283 mm., of which the writing occupies 200 × 290 mm. in double columns of 44 lines; on many leaves there are coloured borders. The decoration is rather lavish; in addition to the illuminated borders are initials coloured alternately red and blue, many others illuminated, and seventy-four miniatures of a delicate and spirited technique. Two full pages are also highly decorated; the first (f. 82r°) corresponding to some former volume division, and the second (f. 212r°) adorning the opening of the final section of the work, *La Mort al Roi Artus*. The

[1] In all citations from the manuscript the orthography of the scribe is rigidly adhered to and no attempt is made to emend. Punctuation is added very sparsely, and only in so far as it is necessary to clarify the meaning and to prevent ambiguities. The extracts are in no sense "edited".

[2] M. Tyson, *Hand-List of the Collections of French and Italian Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library* (1930), pp. 8-9. (Reprinted from the BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. XIV.

binding, apparently English of the early eighteenth century, is a plain red morocco of medium quality, with, as its only decoration, a plain gilt rectangle round the edge and another in the centre of the covers. The spine of each volume bears the title *Histoire du Roi Artus MSS. Tom. I, Tom. II,* and each is contained in a case of light brown leather, made in 1882, bearing on the spine the title *Lancelot du Lac, MS. on vellum, circa A.D. 1300, I, II.* The volumes are divided into 34 gatherings (17 forming the first volume, and 18 the second), usually of 8 leaves, although the number varies occasionally owing to the loss of odd leaves and is altered to suit the division of the work into its respective sections. The gatherings contain the following leaves: Volume I: 7, 8, 7, 8, 8, 7, 8, 8, 10, 4, 6,/8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8; Volume II: 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8/4, 7, 8, 8, 7,/4, 5, 8, 5, 8, 8, 8. The stroke (/) in the description of Volume I indicates the decorated page which once was the opening page of a volume, the strokes in that of Volume II the beginning and ending of the section *La Queste del Saint Graal.* In the first few gatherings of the first volume there are partially erased signatures which indicate the order of the leaves within the gatherings. These are as follows: bb, bc, bd, on ff. 8, 9, 10; cd, ce, cg, on ff. 16, 17, 18; de, df, dg, dh, on ff. 23, 24, 25, 26; ef, eg, on ff. 30, 31; fg, fh, fi, f (second letter cut away by the binder's knife) on ff. 38, 39, 40, 41. This apparently does not continue for the rest of the manuscript, but as the markings are very close to the outer edge of the leaf the binder's knife may have removed them. The order of the gatherings is also indicated in the more usual manner by means of catchwords. Many of these have been cut off during the process of binding, but those which remain are in two hands, the first contemporary with that of the scribe and the second of the fifteenth century. There are some curious orthographical variants between the catchwords and the text to which they refer. On f. 61 for example the catchword, in a fifteenth century hand, is *Mieulx la table Reonde,* referring to the *mieus la table reonde* of the text. More interesting, perhaps, is the case on f. 71. There the catchword is *Il ne vouloit oncques,* in a fifteenth century hand, whereas the scribe of the manuscript prefers *il ne voloit onkes,* showing that he came from some northern area of France,

probably Picardy. His spelling is full of northern peculiarities. The fifteenth-century binder employed, however, the orthography of the Parisian area. Another Picard trait of the scribe is shown in the catchword to f. 153. The text reads *batent lors haches en terre*, the *ch* for the standard French *c* being typically Picard,[1] but the catchword, although contemporary with the scribe of the manuscript, reads *batent lor haces en terre*.

In general the manuscript is in a good condition. In spite of the fact that several leaves are missing,[2] the text is a valuable one, and the miniatures, some of which have been cut out and the damaged leaves removed, form a useful source of information concerning contemporary habits, costume and armour.

The manuscript was acquired by the Rylands Library in 1901 from the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, together with many others which formed part of the same magnificent collection; the bookplate of the Bibliotheca Lindesiana is still inside the front cover of each volume. In the Crawford Library the two volumes were recorded separately as French manuscripts 1 and 2. Lord Crawford purchased them in March 1882, from Bernard Quaritch, together with the cases which now hold them. While in the Crawford collection much was discovered about the contents, as is shown by the more correct title *Lancelot del Lac* on the cases. Also, the manuscript was rebound in the correct order. At one time the opening of the final section, *La Mort al Roi Artus*, now f. 212, was the opening of volume one, and f. 82 the first leaf of volume two. The various alterations in the foliation in pencil in the top left-hand corner of the leaf are evidence that several attempts were made before all was correctly arranged. In the bottom right-hand corner of f. 212r° is a tiny note, *vol i* and, beneath it, half cut away by a binder's knife, *i vol.* These no doubt refer to the fact that at one time this page was the first one of the manuscript. Furthermore, ff. 212 to the end are numbered, in what seems very like modern pencil, from one onwards in a quasi antique numerotation.

[1] The linguistic peculiarities of the scribe will be mentioned in more detail below, p. 341. For an account of the Picard dialect in Old French see M. K. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester (1934), § 1320.

[2] These are accounted for in detail below.

Quaritch acquired the volumes from the Bibliotheca Sunderlandiana, broken up by sale in 1881 ; incidentally, this Library had been previously offered in its entirety to several other collectors, including Lord Crawford. In the Sunderland Sale Catalogue, where it formed Lot 670, the manuscript is one of the more important items. It is described at great length and is also mentioned separately in the introduction. This description is very valuable in confirming the fact that before Lord Crawford acquired it the leaves were bound in an incorrect order. The two highly decorated pages are described in detail, and it is seen that the present f. 212 was f. 1, and the present f. 82 the first leaf of the second volume. The manuscript still bears on the end papers at the beginning of each volume the Sunderland shelf marks, namely (Vol. I) K. K. 2 : 7 in ink in rather large characters, and beneath it in pencil a later marking, 105 l, 13. Volume II bears similar marks, arranged in the same way : K. K. 2 : 8, and 105 l, 14.[1] In the published Catalogue of the Sunderland Collection[2] the volumes are given the following description : "Arthur, King : Le Roman du Roi Artus et des Compaignons de la Table Ronde. MS. sur vélim, et décoré de figures et autres ornemens peints en or et en couleurs. 2 voll. fol. 105 l." It seems probable that the manuscript was acquired for the Sunderland Library by Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland, 4th Lord Spencer, the famous rival as a bibliophile of Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, the founder of another great collection. It has so far been impossible to determine whence Sunderland obtained the manuscript. He is noted for the high prices which he paid for his books, and also for the fact that the binding with which he protected them was usually a mediocre quality red morocco, whereas his successors preferred a high quality binding, very seldom red morocco, with much decoration in gilt. Although the unprinted catalogue of the early editions in the Library at Blenheim mentions three

[1] For a reproduction of the Sunderland press mark see Seymour de Ricci, *English Collectors of Books and Manuscripts and their marks of ownership.* Cambridge (1930), p. 39.

[2] *Catalogue of the Books in the Library of Blenheim Palace,* Oxford (1872). The edition was limited to 50 copies, of which one finds a place in the Rylands Library.

manuscripts, it does not give any information concerning this one.[1] For the present, therefore, it must suffice to say that the manuscript's earliest known owner was the 3rd Earl of Sunderland.

The two volumes contain, as has been stated above, the second half of the Vulgate Arthurian Cycle. They represent the second half of a complete text of that Cycle, of which the first half has been lost, just as MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 95 is the first half of a text of the Vulgate Cycle of which the second half is preserved in one of the Phillipps manuscripts. It is a not unusual thing for this text to become split up in this way. Ferdinand Lot,[2] lists no less than thirteen manuscripts which contain the second half of the cycle and various others, to the total of twenty-eight, which contain parts of the cycle. None of those which are described as containing the first part could, by their different descriptions, be considered as representing the lost portion of the Rylands MS. However, another lucky discovery may provide the missing portion, just as MSS. B.N. fr. 95 and Phillipps 130 have been shown to correspond to each other. The Vulgate Cycle has only once in modern times been printed in its entirety, and since the printed edition is more easily available than the manuscripts it is convenient to compare the Rylands manuscript with Sommer's edition of the Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances,[3] of

[1] The manuscript catalogue of the Blenheim books is in the British Museum, King's MSS. 383, 384. This was prepared from the slip catalogue, now B.M. Add. MS. 11512.

[2] *Étude sur le Lancelot en Prose.* Paris, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. 226 (1918), p. 1, note 1, p. 11, note 1.

[3] H. O. Sommer, *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances edited from Manuscripts in the British Museum.* Washington, The Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1909-1916, 8 vol. 4to: I (1909), *L'estoire del Saint Graal;* II (1908), *L'estoire de Merlin;* III (1910), *Le livre de Lancelot del Lac* (Part I); IV (1911), *Le Livre de Lancelot del Lac* (Part II); V (1912), *Le Livre de Lancelot del Lac* (Part III); VI (1913), *Les Aventures ou la Queste del Saint Graal; La Mort al Roi Artus;* VII (1913), *Le Livre d'Artus;* VIII (1916); *Index of Names and Places.*

Sommer chose as the base of this " monumental if inaccurate " edition Add. MSS. 10292-10294 in the British Museum. The choice was dictated by personal convenience rather than by the merits of the manuscript.

Various parts of the cycle have been the object of editions in recent years. Sommer himself edited the *Merlin* as early as 1894: *Le Roman de Merlin or the*

which it represents Volumes V and VI. Indeed, inserted inside the first volume is a note dated 12th November, 1906, left by Sommer himself which makes this remark, and also adds that certain leaves are missing. He compares the manuscript in this respect with those in the British Museum upon which he was working at the time.

The Rylands MS. opens in the middle of a sentence[1]— " mendiroie quant moi plairoit et ma volentes est tele que iou men voel aler ia au vespre, car bien sachies que iou ne gerra a nuit en ostel nul se iou ne gis en lostel a la iouene dame de qui iou me parti ne mie granment a la fontaine v iou vous trouai." This is part of an adventure of Guerrhes, who encountered three ladies by the side of a spring and restored to the eldest one her daughter, taken from her by a knight whose unchivalrous conduct he later punished by slaying him. In this section there are several lacunae. Between ff. 4 and 5 a leaf is missing; a miniature has been cut away, the knife marks being still visible on the later folios, and the damaged leaf later removed.[2] Another

early History of King Arthur (London, privately printed). He used the same MS. as base. The '*Queste del Saint Graal*' was edited in 1864 by F. J. Furnivall for the Roxburghe Club; he used MS. Brit. Mus. Royal 14 E iii, as base. A more modern and scholarly edition of the *Queste* is that by A. Pauphilet: *La Queste del Saint Graal, roman du XIII^e siècle* (Classiques français du moyen âge), Paris, (1923). This edition is based on MS. 77 of the Palais des Arts Library in Lyons, but contains readings from seven other manuscripts. The *Mort al Roi Artus* has enjoyed two separate editions: *Mort Artu, An Old French Romance of the 13th century being the last division of the Lancelot du Lac, now first edited from MS.* 342 (*Fonds Français*) *of the Bibliothèque Nationale with collations from some other MSS.*, by J. Douglas Bruce, Halle a. S., (1910), and *La Mort Le Roi Artu, roman du XIII^e siècle*, édité par Jean Frappier, Paris, 1936. The only part of the Lancelot proper to be edited separately is the story of the " Knight of the Cart ", which is not in the Rylands MS. *Le Roman en prose de Lancelot du Lac : Le Conte de La Charrette*, édité par Gweneth Hutchings, Paris (1938).

Throughout the present article references are to Sommer's edition. Although in many ways this edition is inferior to those of the individual branches of the cycle, it is the only one which embraces the whole of the Rylands MS. and for the present purpose nothing would be gained by referring to three editions instead of one.

[1] Sommer, Vol. V, p. 23, line 21.

[2] F. 4 ends: " quant il est montes si vient Sorneham tous armes sor un grant cheval et ne sentresaluent . . . " (Sommer V, p. 34, l. 5). F. 5 begins: "ent tere virent " (Sommer V, p. 36, l. 21).

leaf has been removed for the same reason between the present ff. 17 and 18.[1] A leaf has also been removed between ff. 45 and 46.[2] Between ff. 73 and 74 there is a lacuna of two leaves.[3] A miniature has been cut away between ff. 73 and 74, and the hole in f. 74 mended with parchment. The rest of this section, the third part of the Lancelot proper, is complete, until the end (f. 181v°). Throughout the whole section the writing is even and well spaced. The only stained page is the verso of f. 81, where the writing is rather cramped, and over-runs the line. This has at one time formed the last page of a volume, and the scribe no doubt had difficulties in arranging his material in a rather limited space. The page, although stained, is quite legible.

The text of the Lancelot proper presents some very interesting features. The scribe is normally careful; there are very few expunctions and several corrections, as though the manuscript has passed through the hands of a contemporary reviser. The text is similar to that published by Sommer. There are several small omissions due to homoeoteleuton (e.g. on f. 20r°, col. 1, the Rylands MS. reads "Quant la roine oi cheste auenture si fu moult esbahie", whereas Sommer (i.e. Add. 10293) reads "Quant la roine oi ceste parole que Lancelot a este en telle auenture si en fu esbahie que . . ."); errors of this kind seem unavoidable, even in the most carefully written texts. In addition our manuscript has the peculiarity of sometimes offering a version which is much shorter than that of Sommer's base text, even when the later version is a condensed rendering of that of other manuscripts. The following passage on f. 59r° is a case in point: 'Lors apiele mon seigneur Gauuain et lui dist: "Ales biaus nies au tres le roi Baudemagu et si emprendes le tournoiement de nostre part." Et il se lieue maintenant et sen vait auoec cels qui illuec estoient

[1] F. 17 ends: "et li rois nestoit mie en la sale a chel eure ains estoit en un praeil (Sommer, V, p. 70, l. 11). F. 18 begins: "ele quide ke boines li soient pour venir (Sommer V, p. 72, l. 26). It is interesting to note that in this case the letters in the margin indicating the order of the leaves are on f. 17 ce, and on f. 18 cg, thus demonstrating that at the time of these markings, probably the fifteenth century, these leaves had not been removed (*vide supra*, p. 319).

[2] The lacuna corresponds to Sommer's, Vol. V, p. 144, l. 3 to p. 147, l. 38. This missing leaf is the last one of a gathering.

[3] Corresponding to Vol. V, p. 233, l. 18 to p. 233, l. 37 of Sommer.

et le fianche, et puis retourne a court pour atorner sa gent, et li rois Artus lui dist: "Gauuain, Gauuain, aues oi que li rois Baudemagus a pris tournoiement encontre nous? Par foi sil nauoit chaiens fors ma priuee maisnie si le quideroie iou desconfire." "Sire, fait mesires Gauuains, par la foi que iou vous doi, chou a il fait par la seurte au bon chevalier as armes vermeilles." Ensi parlerent tant quil fu eure de couchier, si ala chascuns a son hostel. Et li rois se coucha en vne chambre loing de gent, tous seul. Et Lancelot prist congie au roi Baudemagu et lui dist quil iroit a Camaalot parler a .J. preudomme priueement, et li rois dist par Dieu. Si ont tant cheuauchie entre Lancelot et Boort quil vienent iuscal mur que la roine auoit dit a Boort. Et il troevent luis ouert si entrent ens et atakent lor chevaus a .J. arbre. Et quant la roine quida quil fust tans si fist toutes ses damoiseles aler coucher lune cha, et lautre la, et lor dist kele not cure de noise."[1] It must not be assumed from this extract that the Rylands MS. represents a shortened version of the romance, for such is very far from being the case. In many respects our text is unusually complete and often the account which it gives is the longer and more detailed. From f. 140v°, col. 2 to f. 164r°, col. 2, there is recounted in full the adventures undergone by Bohort, Lionel, Hector and Gauvain in the last quest for Lancelot. These adventures are only found, so far as is at present known, in one other copy, the fifteenth-century Harleian MS. 6342.[2] It seems unlikely that they are in any of the manuscripts in French libraries, for Ferdinand Lot, who worked on the Paris manuscripts, remarks of these adventures: "Elles sont racontées dans le ms. du fonds Harley 6342 au British Museum. Cette addition est publiée par O. Sommer, t. V. p. 413-474."[3] The text of the Rylands MS. in this part is very close to that published by Sommer. The chief differences are scribal, and modernisations of language in the Harleian MS. This passage, occurring as it does in an early fourteenth-

[1] This is the equivalent of Sommer's Vol. V, p. 182, l. 4 to p. 183, l. 2.

[2] They have been printed by Sommer from the Harleian MS. as the Appendix to Vol. V of his edition. He evidently did not notice their presence in the Rylands MS. when he examined it.

[3] *Étude sur le Lancelot en prose*, p. 377, n. 2.

century manuscript, shows that the technique of recounting in full adventures which elsewhere are simply described as having taken place, is not a specifically late device. These adventures are certainly an expansion of the original form of the romance, but their discovery in the Rylands MS. shows that this development took place earlier than has hitherto been supposed.

In many other respects also the version of the romance in our manuscript is lengthier and more verbose than that of B.M. Add. MS. 10292-4, for example. From f. 96 onwards there is related the adventure of Bohort, who rescues a damsel and her "ami" from robbers who are waylaying them. There is a more detailed introduction to the episode in the Rylands MS. and throughout it agrees more closely with the version of Harl. MS. 6342 than any other.

Occasionally, however, there are other examples of the version of the Rylands MS. being highly abridged. A case in point is the account of Perceval's being placed in the seat on the right of the Siege Perilleus. The Lancelot section is then at the same time more verbose and detailed than the published version, and also in parts an abridged version of that account. Thus, from the point of view of text alone one is unable to determine the exact relationship between the Rylands and the B.M. manuscripts; it is only possible to describe them both as collateral versions of a common original.

The *Queste del Saint Graal* is introduced by the concluding sentence of the previous section: "Mais atant fenist chi endroit maistre Gautiers Map son liure de Lancelot del Lac, si commence a parler du saint graal."[1] The Graal section has unfortunately lost the opening leaf, no doubt because it was highly decorated, as is f. 212. Thus it commences in the middle of a sentence: "ke on fait par laiens de Bohort et de Lyonel car grant pierche auoit quil ne les auoient veu. Et li rois commande que les tables soient mises car il est temps de mengier."[2] Ff. 182 to 204 seem to be

[1] F. 181v° col. ii. Sommer, Vol. V, p. 409.

[2] The equivalent of Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 6, l. 1 ff. It is interesting to note that the fifteenth-century catchword at the foot of f. 181 is *a la veille*, i.e. the opening of the Graal section ('a la veille de la Pentecouste', etc.), thus the leaf must have been removed after this date.

rather different from the rest of the manuscript. The parchment is coarser, thicker and rather discoloured, and the writing somewhat heavier and coarser, while the miniatures are of a different and possibly earlier execution. The writing, although rather less skilfully performed, does not, however, necessarily need explaining by a change of scribe. The orthography of this part is remarkably consistent with that of the rest of the volumes and from ff. 200 to 204 there is a gradual change to the more pleasant script. In these few folios (181-204) there are no coloured borders and the few rubrics to the miniatures seem to have been added later. These folios have every appearance of having been executed rather hurriedly by the same scribe as the rest of the manuscript and then illuminated by a different hand. There are several expunctions and many alterations. Notes have been made in the outer margin by a reviser and the errors later corrected by the scribe. For example, on f. 197 there are small crosses in the outer margin against words which have not been clearly written and these have later been rewritten by the scribe or a contemporary. On f. 196 a repetition of a sentence has been corrected both by expuncting it and by crossing out.

There are certain leaves missing from this section which require noting. It has already been mentioned that the opening leaf has been removed, and there are other lacunae as follows: Between ff. 204 and 205 there is a rather large section missing. F. 204 is the last of the rather coarser ones of the volume and from f. 205 onwards the leaves are similarly arranged to those of the rest of the manuscript. F. 204 ends with the words " tout le iour demoura laiens Percheval ", which form part of one of Perceval's adventures in the Quest of the Graal.[1] F. 205 begins in the middle of a sentence,[2] and soon a new paragraph opens which treats of Lancelot : " Or dist li contes que quant Lancelos fu venus a leve de Marcoise." [3] This large lacuna, the equivalent of over a hundred printed pages, is probably due to the loss of a number of gatherings. A normal folio of our manuscript is the equivalent of about four and a half printed pages, therefore this

[1] The equivalent of Sommer, Vol. VI, p. 68, l. 30.
[2] The equivalent of Sommer, Vol. VI, p. 173, l. 18.
[3] Sommer, Vol. VI, p. 174, l. 10.

lacuna is one of about twenty leaves, either two ten leaf gatherings, or two of eight leaves and one of four. It was probably on account of this lacuna that Sommer failed to notice the extra section in the Lancelot proper part of the manuscript when he examined it.[1] Two other leaves are missing from *La Queste del Saint Graal*. The first after f. 205,[2] and the second at the end of the branch. The concluding words are: " . . . et la merueille du graal et le pooir que Diex i ot mis e chil ert desloiaus et crueus comme chil ki tous ert estrais de maluaise lig-".[3] The text of this part of the manuscript has never yet been used or consulted for the purposes of an edition. An examination of it shows it to be fairly close to the group B^3 of Pauphilet's classification,[4] although there are many readings of the A^2 group. A complete collation of the text with all manuscripts is necessary before any but very general conclusions can be reached.

The final section, the *Mort al Roi Artus*, opens on f. 212, a highly decorated page, with the following explanation of the *raison d'être* of the work: " Chi commence li liures des mors Artus Gauuain et tous les autres compaignons de la taule reonde et toute la fins. [rubric.] Apres che que maistres Gautiers Map ot traitie des auentures del saint graal asses souffissaument, si comme il fu auis au roi Henri son signour ke che quil auoit fait nen deuoit pas souffrir sil ne racontoit la fin de chiaus dont il auoit deuant fait mention comment chil moururent de qui il auoit les proeches ramenteues en son liure, et par che commencha il cheste darrainne partie, et quant il lot mise emsamble, si lapiela la mort al roi Artu, pour che que vers la fin est escrit comment li rois Artus fu naures es plains de Salebieres et comment il sen parti de Girflet qui tant lui fist compaignie que apres lui ne fu

[1] Sommer's note in the MS. takes no account of any of these lacunae nor of the extra adventures described *supra*, pp. 325-26.

[2] The equivalent of Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 176, l. 18 to p. 178, l. 36.

[3] F. 211. The equivalent of Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 196, l. 4.

[4] In his introduction, *vide supra*, p. 322 n. 3, Pauphilet does not consider our MS. for the purpose of establishing his text. For further study of problems connected with the " Queste " see: Albert Pauphilet, *Etudes sur la Queste del Saint Graal attribué à Gautier Map*, Paris (1921); Myrrha Lot-Borodine, *Trois Essais sur la Quête du Saint Graal*, Paris (1921); Étienne Gilson, " La mystique de la grâce dans la *Queste del Saint Graal* " (Romania, Vol. LI (1925), pp. 323-347).

nus hom qui le veist viuant. Si commenche maistre Gautiers ceste darainne partie." The imputing of the authorship of the work to Walter Map, the actual author of some works such as the "De nugis curialium", is a literary device probably of the actual author of the work rather than of a scribe. The "roi Henri" is of course Henry II of England, who died in 1189. Map himself died between the 15th of March, 1208, and the 5th of June, 1210. Since the Prose Lancelot has as its *terminus a quo* 1214, Map's authorship is clearly impossible.[1] The author's prologue to this last section is interesting from various points of view. Illustrating as it does the medieval desire to cloak anonymity under an unimpeachable source, it also expounds certain ideas on the construction of the romance. The author provides this "darraine partie" for no other reason than that the reader would expect to learn how the various dramatis personæ ended their careers.

This last branch of the cycle, by all counts the most powerful and the most dramatic, is well preserved in the Rylands MS. The lavish decoration of the opening leaf is symbolic of the grandeur of the closing stages of the reign of Arthur. The last forty or so folios of the two volumes contain nineteen of the seventy-four miniatures, and there are traces of several others having been cut away. That is, in less than one-sixth of the whole manuscript there are to be found over a quarter of the miniatures and one magnificently preserved decorated page. This is rather unusual, as in many manuscripts of the Vulgate cycle the last, and from the æsthetic point of view the most moving, section of the work is less well-illustrated than the preceding branches. Economically it was not always, indeed very seldom was it, possible to provide rich and numerous miniatures right to the very end of such a lengthy work as the Vulgate Cycle. The Rylands MS. has not been shorn of its glories through a desire to curtail expense, and the most deserving branch is the best illustrated.

There are a certain number of leaves missing from this section,

[1] For a complete discussion of the problems of date and authorship of the Vulgate cycle, *vide* F. Lot, *Étude*, Ch. VI. Date de Composition de l'Œuvre, Patrie et condition sociale de l'auteur, pp. 126-165.

nearly all of them because miniatures have been cut away and the damaged leaf removed. The cuts on the succeeding leaves have in many cases been mended with narrow strips of transparent parchment. After f. 213 two or three leaves are missing owing to a leaf having been damaged by the cutting out of a miniature; the missing leaves [1] describe the adventures of Lancelot when he stays at the house of the "Dame d'Escalot". Between ff. 218 and 219 there is a similar lacuna.[2] Between ff. 230 and 231 there is another pair of leaves missing,[3] and also between ff. 232 and 233.[4] The remaining lacuna is at the end of the volume where the last gathering is missing. This last gathering may, however, have never been completed. The last miniature has no rubric, although there is a space left for one, and it is possible that the miniatures of the last eight leaves were never executed. The manuscript ends with an incomplete sentence: "Quant li chevalier le roi Yon virent leur signor mort, il se claiment las caitif et commenchent a plourer et a faire trop grant duel, et pour le duel remest le chache a saresterent tout entour le cors, et quant chil qui deuant fuioient virent que chil estoient areste sour le cors, il sorent tantost que chestoit aucune haute personne." [5] The missing leaves contain the rest of the account of the great battle in the West, the death of Arthur and the break up of the kingdom of Logres.

Interesting though this manuscript is from the point of view of the text which it contains, it is even more interesting for the miniatures adorning the text and the information which it gives concerning the execution of the illustrations. The miniatures are seventy-four in number, and there are traces of several others having been cut away.[6] They are not evenly distributed throughout the text. There are cases of three on two folios, and twenty folios with no miniature at all. There are at least three different types, each due to a different artist. Those

[1] Corresponding to Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 208, l. 25 to p. 218, l. 22.

[2] Corresponding to Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 231, l. 17, to p. 236, n. 28.

[3] Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 270, l. 3 to p. 277, n. 1.

[4] Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 287, l. 29 to p. 293, l. 25.

[5] The equivalent of Sommer's Vol. VI, p. 368, l. 26. Sommer's edition ends on p. 391, l. 7.

[6] These are noted above in the description of the lacunae.

of the first part of *La Queste del Saint Graal* as far as the big lacuna after f. 205 are of a very different technique from those of the rest of the volumes. They are simpler, and rather cruder. Often they have no rubric, and the border is a simple one in black. Their shape is sometimes made more attractive by adapting them to an architectural framework. Those of the other parts of the manuscript are of the width of one column of the writing, whereas some in the first part of *La Queste del Saint Graal* are rather wider.[1] These rather simpler miniatures, the coarser surface of the vellum, and the rather less skilled script all give the impression that these leaves were written earlier than the rest of the manuscript. This may be so, but it is rather unlikely. More likely is it that the leaves have been stained and ill-treated by excessive usage, that the scribe was perhaps imitating a cruder style of writing, or it may even be an unconscious variation in his style, and the miniatures were probably executed by an older artist who was trained a generation or so before the artist who painted the others. The differences in scribal technique may quite well belong to one man. Critics too often assume that because a page has a different appearance it is due to a change of scribe. In cases such as these it is necessary to examine the similarities just as much as the differences. There are no reasons in this particular instance why the same scribe should not have been responsible for the whole of the volume. The orthography is remarkably constant with that of the rest of the manuscript and the abbreviations used are exactly the same throughout.

The miniatures of the remainder of the manuscript fall into two distinct classes. There are those in the body of the text which are headed by rubrics and mark the beginnings of "chapters" in the romance.[2] These are very carefully and spiritedly executed. The tints of the buildings and landscapes in them are delicious half-tones and all are framed in a border of a rather standard pattern. Occasionally, particularly in battle

[1] The miniatures in the other parts of the text measure 94 × 75 mm., whereas the long ones under discussion, especially the one on f. 182v°, col. 2, measure 125 × 81 mm.

[2] Usually measuring 94 × 75 mm., with a border 6 mm. wide.

scenes, an air of movement and life is given by overcrowding with figures whose extremities and weapons often overrun the frame of the picture. The other miniatures are in the lower margin of the page and seem to have been added later. None of them have rubrics and they are rather smaller than the first type.[1] In execution they are simple and bold in colour. This artist has a liking for bright reds and blues as opposed to the half-tones of his colleague. The borders are narrower than the first type and edged with gold. The content of the picture never overruns this border.

Both these types are edged with red and blue borders, but there is a rather curious difference in the way in which the two artists have arranged the colours. In the case of the larger ones in the body of the text two opposite sides of the rectangular frame of the picture are of the same colour, whereas in the case of the smaller ones the two adjoining sides are of the same colour. The smaller ones are all added beneath initials which mark " chapters " in the romance. The two types occur in all sections of the manuscript : there are forty-five in the body of the text,[2] nineteen small ones in the bottom margin of the page which seem to have been added after the manuscript was completed,[3] and ten in the *Graal* section which seem to be of an earlier technique.[4] It is seen immediately that this uneven distribution is rather striking. There is a group of folios at the end of the manuscript which is well illustrated ; this, as has been mentioned above, is one of the most powerful parts of the romance. The earlier section of the *Graal* is also copiously furnished with miniatures. This also is a section to which it is desirable to draw attention. The more " humdrum " parts of the story are simply adorned with a miniature at the opening of the major section of the work, and it is interesting to note that the addition of the miniatures at the

[1] 88 × 50 mm., with a border 3 mm. wide.

[2] On ff. 16*d*, 24*c*, 46*c*, 59*a*, 77*a*, 82*a*, 84*d*, 90*a*, 94*d*, 96*a*, 101*d*, 105*b*, 109*a*, 114*d*, 118*a*, 121*b*, 122*b*, 133*b*, 139*c*, 140*d*, 143*c*, 148*c*, 158*c*, 167*a*, 172*c*, 179*b*, 208*b*, 211*d*, 212*a*, 216*d*, 220*d*, 223*a*, 224*d*, 226*b*, 228*b*, 230*b*, 231*d*, 240*c*, 242*a*, 244*c*, 252*a*, 252*d*, 253*c*, 254*b*, 255*b*. (The letters refer to columns of the folio.)

[3] On ff. 13*c*, 15*b*, 24*a*, 25*c*, 33*b*, 38*b*, 43*d*, 48*c*, 53*c*, 53*d*, 66*c*, 72*b*, 73*b*, 191*b*, 193*d*, 194*d*, 205*b*, 223*d*, 239*c*.

[4] On ff. 182*b*, 182*d*, 183*d*, 184*d*, 188*a*, 188*d*, 190*a*, 192*a*, 195*d*, 198*d*.

bottom of the page is most frequent in those parts which are less important from the point of view of their literary content. They seem to represent an attempt to make the distribution of the miniatures more even, instead of allowing the larger number of miniatures to emphasise the importance of the text.

One of the more interesting features of the miniatures is the fact that it is possible to learn from them something of the guidance given to the artists for their construction. In many manuscripts of prose romances, particularly the later ones, the miniatures are headed by a rubric which is in reality a chapter heading. In the earlier prose romance texts the rubrics are very often in the form of instructions to the artists. There are some very interesting examples of the later type of rubric in the Rylands MS., as, for instance, on f. 101v°, col. ii, where the rubric to the miniature in the text is as follows: "Ensi que Lancelot en .i. paueillon et a trouue vne damoisiele et nain bochu et dedens a vn bel lit et .i. cherge ardant et vns chevaliers y vient a qui lancelot se combat a piet."[1] From the point of view of the story itself the only necessary remarks are the last ones, concerning the fight between Lancelot and the "chevalier". From the point of view of the miniaturist, however, there is here a source of information concerning the picture which he has to paint, and he reproduces painstakingly, not only the single combat between Lancelot and the stranger knight, but also two tents, in one of which is a lady in bed, two candles lighting the interior of the tent, and, at the foot of the bed, a dwarf. Thus the rubric is nothing other than a description of what it was intended the miniaturist should paint. Another similar and possibly more striking example is to be found on f. 109v°, col. ii. The rubric to a particularly fine miniature is: "Ensi que li chevalier de la table reonde se sieent au disner et uns chevaliers sest assis ou siege perilleus et foudres et fus est chaus sour lui et la tout ars et li rois et la royne sieent a une autre table."[2] The information given about the following story is actually a résumé of it. There is related how a knight sat in the Siege Perilleus and was punished for his presumption. The interesting part of the rubric is the

[1] The text corresponds to Sommer, Vol. V, p. 303, l. 33.

[2] The text corresponds to Sommer, Vol. V, p. 320, l. 22.

curious piece of information that at the time the king and queen happened to be seated at another table. In the miniature the knight is seated on the right of the picture, at a straight table, together with two others; the table is divided in the centre so that Arthur and his queen are at a separate table. The picture reproduces carefully the "foudres et fus" which destroy the hapless knight, and also the two separate tables. Thus, again, the rubric contains practical instructions for the miniaturist. Examples of this kind could be multiplied at great length for most of the rubrics could be shown to be instructions of this kind. The problem is, however, that the rubrics were added last, as is shown by the fact that the last miniature in the manuscript has no rubric although there is a space left for it, and other rubrics are carefully arranged round pinnacles and other projections over the border. Thus the rubric could not have been written down in its place and then the miniature executed according to it. Moreover, instruction would also be needed for those miniatures which bear no rubric at all. It seems, therefore, that the hypothesis that the miniaturist was guided by the rubrics is untenable. The Rylands MS. provides the answer to the problem. A careful examination revealed that in the bottom margin of many folios are apparent erasures of writing. On further inquiry it was noted that these occur mainly on folios containing miniatures, and it was decided to examine them under ultra-violet rays. This examination proved fruitful indeed, as it showed that these markings were indeed erasures, many of which followed a fixed pattern and all of which referred to the miniatures. In the lower margin of each column containing a miniature there are several lines, written in a small late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century hand, much closer to a court hand than to a book hand, all of which begin with some expression such as *Si com* or *Ensi que*, and occasionally *Chi endroit*. Then follows an account, very often, unfortunately, entirely indecipherable, of the content of the miniature. Below, written in a clumsy book hand, is the rubric to head the picture. As soon as this was established it immediately became clear how the miniaturist fulfilled his task. The scribe wrote the text, leaving room for miniatures, and then an overseer noted in the bottom margin

what was required in the miniature. This was then expressed underneath in a much shorter form as a rubric. After the miniature had been completed, the rubric was copied above it and the manuscript cleaned of all superfluous matter at the bottom of the page. In the case of the second of the rubrics cited, which is a rather lengthy one, there is only the instruction at the bottom of the page, and no rubric in the large clumsy hand. The instructions were, therefore, reproduced as the rubric.

By means of the ultra-violet lamp it has been possible to recover something of these erased instructions.[1] The only other example which I have been able to find of this particular procedure is in a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; MS. 342 of the fonds français, a copy of the Vulgate cycle, contains similar instructions in the lower margin as: "si com Boort encontra . . . home de religion qui portoit corpus domini". In the Rylands MS., however, the instructions are usually rather more lengthy and detailed. In many cases, unfortunately, the only portion of the erasure which is decipherable is that nearest to the inner margin, where it has not been possible to rub off the writing so thoroughly. Even these vestiges give useful information, as, for instance, on f. 16v°, where the rubric to the miniature is: "Ensi que lancelos encon[tra] vne damoisele en vne forest qui plouroit et dementoit mout fort."[2] The miniature depicts Lancelot fully armed on horseback about to meet a lady, who is also on horseback, in a forest. The traces beneath are: ". . . lancelot encontra . . . a . . . le qui chevauchoit". This provides the information that the miniaturist was instructed to draw the various characters on horseback. More interesting perhaps are the traces beneath the miniature on f. 24v°. The rubric is: "Chi iouste estoit du mares devant la fontaine et les ar arbres ou li hyaumes pendent." The traces beneath are as follows: there are four lines in a small hand of which one can read the ends "attaint che . . . lettres escrites . . . vont . . . chaust (?) . . .", beneath which is written, in

[1] I am indebted to Dr. Tyson who kindly loaned a lamp for this purpose, and to the authorities of the John Rylands Library who gave permission for the manuscript to be examined in this way.

[2] The text corresponds to Sommer, Vol. V, p. 67, l. 14.

the large hand, the rubric as above. In the miniature there are two knights engaged in single combat on the left, in the centre are trees from which shields, helmets and swords are hanging. Over a spring there hang three shields and helmets, underneath which are written the names of Gauvain, Agravain and Lancelot.[1] It is, no doubt, to these names that the words " lettres escrites " in the instructions refer. Thus the miniaturist seems to have had quite detailed guidance in such matters. On f. 96r° there is a most interesting miniature showing how Bohort rescued a lady and her " ami " from robbers who were attacking them. The robbers are provided with the faces of men, monkeys, dogs, and even pigs. It would be most interesting to discover whether the artist was asked to paint them in this way or whether he did so of his own accord. Unfortunately the instructions beneath, although copious, are unreadable; the erasor has been very thorough. There are eight lines of small writing of which all that can be deciphered is: " Einsi que bohors . . . eut . . . soy ", and, below this, in the larger hand: " Chi rescouse bohors . . . voelent murdrir . . . " which corresponds to the rubric: " Chi rescoust bohors une demisiele et son ami que reubeur voloient murdirir."[2] In view of the fact that there are as many as eight lines, it seems likely that full and detailed instructions were given to the artist concerning this particular composition. The rubric to the miniature on f. 109v° has been discussed above,[3] and the instructions in the bottom margin are exactly the same as the rubric. In this case, in which the rubric is an unusually long one, it seems as though the rubric following the instructions to the miniaturist has been omitted, and the rubricator has treated these instructions as though they were the rubric itself.

In the lower margin of f. 118r°, col. i, the following traces are legible: " chi descendent mesire G et li ost . . . a ost ou royaume le . . . bau . . . " which obviously correspond to the rubric: " Chi descendent mesires G. et li ost le roy Artu a ost ou royaume le roy baudemagu." The miniature below the

[1] The text corresponds to Sommer, Vol. V, p. 89, l. 13.
[2] Corresponding to Sommer's Vol. V, p. 292, l. 11.
[3] *Supra*, pp. 333-34.

rubric depicts six men in a boat about to join four others who have already disembarked. The sea is rendered more realistic by placing within it four fish and an eel.

The miniature on f. 148 is most delicately executed. It shows Ector on horseback on the drawbridge of a castle in the doorway of which is a servant. The castle itself is most delightfully drawn, the windows being of a delicate design, and the walls and roof in shades of brown, green, pink, and slate grey. The mortar between the stones is indicated by faint white lines. The moat, in which fish are swimming, is bordered by small ornamental trees and shrubs. The only guidance which the artist has had to this picture is that of the rubric: "Chi vaut auoir ectors hostel qui queroit lancelot," for all that can be deciphered of the instructions is the following: "einsi . . . chest . . . chi . . . it . . . ectors . . . ", which seems to be nothing more than a rather fuller form of the rubric. The artist of these miniatures needed no further guidance than some word such as "chastel" in order to create wonderful turreted edifices in the most delicate colours and forms.

The instructions for the artist do sometimes, however, describe the colour in which a certain article should be represented, as is the case, for example, on f. 172v°, col. ii. The miniature on this leaf represents the madness of Lancelot.[1] He is shown outside a tent, wearing only a rather tattered shirt, and hacking with a sword at a white shield which is hanging on a tree. The rubric gives certain information, as: "Chi se combat lancelot tous hors du sens a un escu." The erasures at the foot of the page can be read as: ". . . et prie son . . . chi dou ["dou" struck through by the scribe] se combat lancelos tout hors du sens et fous en un blanc escu." The artist was clearly instructed to paint a white shield.

These erasures at the foot of the page are perhaps even more interesting when there is no rubric. The section "*La Queste del Saint Graal*" contains in its early part several miniatures without rubrics. The first in this section, on f. 182, depicts Gauvain attempting unsuccessfully to draw the sword out of the stone.

[1] The text corresponds to Sommer's Vol. V, p. 393, l. 29.

This picture seems rather crudely executed, the river having been drawn first and then the stone over it, with the result that the lines indicating flowing water can be seen behind the stone. There are four lines of instructions in the same hand as the others, which indicates that this section was produced at the same time as the rest of the manuscript, but the illuminations were executed by a different, and probably older, artist. These erasures are not entirely legible, but they can be deciphered as follows :

" Ensi que par Gauains ren . . . tost ala vis
la rive . . . li . . . ente se li roys . . . si int
et nia ala traire . . . . . mais il
le fall . . . . . hors . . . . . ".

This in full conveyed the following idea : that Gauvain went to the river bank with the king and some of the court, and attempted to draw the sword, but failed. It becomes plain that the rather simpler miniatures in the *Graal* section are due to a change of artist, and not to the insertion of leaves from another copy. All the miniatures in this section have been provided with very full instructions, but only parts of them are legible even under ultra-violet rays. To each illustration there are at least four lines of directions. On f. 188r° is a miniature showing one of the single combats of Galahad. Beneath it, in the margin, are three lines of instructions stretching over the width of both columns. This is only partially erased, and would seem to be decipherable. Unfortunately, in the process of erasing the ink has been smudged, with the result that very little of these copious instructions is actually legible. All that can be read is :

" . . . va desor tel blanc et . . .
porte . . . . . ls . . . . . ".

On f. 189v° there is an interesting miniature showing Galahad meeting a knight who is a saint, for he has a nimbus. The rubricator has added above " Chest saint iorges et galaaz ". It is impossible to discover whether the rubricator's introduction of Saint George is his own addition or whether the directions indicated it, for all that can be read of the latter is the word " Galaad ".

As soon as the last section of the work opens the rubrics become rather more lengthy and are in many cases simply a repetition of the directions to the miniaturist. Thus, in the section " La Mort al Roi Artus " many of the rubrics describe the miniature and end with the expression " et a apres mout biaus contes ". Again, of the traces of the directions which are legible many are clearly the same as the rubric, as on f. 228r°, col. ii, where all that can be read of the instructions is : " . . . et la royne a bohort et li conte la mortel trahison que on ly a mis sus ". The rubric to the miniature is : " Chi parole li roys et la royne a bohort et li conte la royne le mortel traison que on li a mis sus." An example of the usual type of rubric in this section occurs on f. 230r°, col. ii : " Chi se combat Lancelos a Mador qui auoit apele la royne e fu Mador desconfis e a apres moult biaus contes." Of the erased directions the following is legible : " chi se combat . . . fu desconfis . . . biaus . . ." From this and other similar examples it appears that the practice in this latter section of the volume was to treat the directions to the artist actually as the rubric. Most of the miniatures of this section are well preserved. They are vigorous in their battle scenes, tender in scenes such as the arrival of the ship bearing the body of the damoisele d'Astolat at Camelot, and full of drama in the scenes such as that of the burial of Gauvain. The latter miniature is on f. 254r°, col. ii, and has as its rubric : " Ensi que chevalier emportent le cors Gauuain en vne biere v quel uns dame y pamoit sous qui estoit nasuree en lespaule et un chevaliers se combati au seigneur de laiens par devant le palais." This indicates that three separate actions are taking place at once in this small picture. The whole is rendered with a rather remarkable effect, for there is no sense of overcrowding as there is in some of the simpler scenes.

The artists responsible for the miniatures were also the designers of the two highly decorated pages, ff. 82 and 212. There are no traces of any directions on either of these leaves, and it is possible that, apart from the miniatures, the artist followed his own course. The miniature on f. 82 represents king Claudas, who is seated in the centre with three men behind him and a dwarf in front, listening to the speech of a lady who is

addressing him. The page is decorated with leaf-like flourishes and sprays which spread from the initial and the miniature. The ends of the sprays are pointed and cusped. On this *ramage* there are grotesque figures, monkeys (one of which is weaving and the other playing a harp), dogs, rabbits, a monk reading, and in the centre at the bottom a long-eared owl. There is a drawing of St. Cecilia carrying an organ which fills a large part of the right-hand margin. The arrangement of the decoration on this page is very similar to that on f. 212. On the latter page there is a large miniature [1] depicting Walter Map, the reputed author of the work, seated, writing his romance, and King Henry standing in front of him. The decoration is arranged in the same way ; corresponding to the figure of St. Cecilia is a picture of two lovers and, as on f. 82, there is a long-eared owl in the centre of the lower margin. Grotesques are grouped on the branches. A man is aiming with a bow at a monkey and another monkey is pruning two trees. Lower down the page a nun is suckling a monkey, and a man is aiming at a parrot ; a rabbit, another nun and several other monkeys are also depicted. These two decorated pages show that the volumes have been cut down very much by a binder's knife, for the figure of St. Cecilia is now on the extreme edge of the leaf, and parts of many of the figures and flourishes have been cut away. The page must at one time have been at least 80 mm. longer and 40 mm. wider than at present.

Apart from enabling us to read the erasures relating to the miniatures, the ultra-violet rays clarified a few other doubtful markings, as follows. On f. 2 a strip of thin parchment has been glued in order to mend a cut left by the excision of a miniature. On this are the letters *ef* and other portions of letters, in a late court hand, probably of the sixteenth century. On f. 13v°, col. ii, is the figure *iii*, possibly a quire number. On f. 43v°, col. ii, the figure *viii*, also probably the number of a quire. In the bottom margin of f. 77v° there is written in blind scratches, in large ungainly letters about two inches high, "M O U R"; it seems impossible to give these any significance, and they

[1] 134 × 83 mm. The miniature on f. 82 is the usual size of those in the text, viz., 94 × 75 mm.

appear to be simply pen trials. On f. 90r° are the words *Chi furent* in a fifteenth-century hand. These also are probably pen trials, as are the words " *Sache tous chil qui che qui du souvenir* ", written on f. 91v° in the same hand. On ff. 202-204 it has been possible to distinguish the markings of a contemporary corrector. Against a correction three lines from the bottom of col. ii of f. 203r° is written *def.* There are small crosses in the outer margins against corrections on the other columns of these folios. On f. 204r°, col. ii the letters *nie* are written against the word *compaignie* in the text.

The lamp revealed no marks of ownership on the end papers or elsewhere which cannot be read without its help.

A consideration of the language, the style of the miniatures and the scribal technique leads us to the conclusion that the manuscript was written in the north of France in the early years of the fourteenth century. The language of the text is clearly a northern dialect of French. The graphies *che*, *chil*, *ke*, are almost sufficient to demonstrate this, but it is necessary to be more precise. The particularities of the Picard dialect are well exemplified in the Rylands Prose Lancelot. Often the characteristic Picard *signour* is found instead of the standard French *seigneur*, as is *vint* instead of *vient*, and so on. The Francien *eau* appears in Picard as *iau*, and we have *biaus* in the manuscript where standard French would have been *beaus*, and *hiaume* for *heaume*. *Damisiele* is found by the side of the more standard *damoisele*. It is quite common to find the Francien *commencer* spelt *commenchier*, the Picard form, in this manuscript, and there is a case of the standard French *cloche* being rendered *cloke* (f. 201c). Often the standard *regarder* is spelt *rewarder*, another typically Picard trait. It will have already been noted that in some of the rubrics quoted the form *le* is used where *la* would be expected (e.g. " le mortel traison ", etc.). This is a specifically Picard characteristic. These peculiarities, which are constant throughout the manuscript, leave no room to doubt that it is the work of a Picard scribe. It is impossible to date the manuscript closely from the language, hand or miniatures, for if they are the work of an older man trained in an earlier school such datations can be as much as a half century wide of accuracy. Such

indications as there are point to the fact that the work was probably executed in the first quarter of the fourteenth century.

Fortunately it is possible to reach further conclusions concerning the provenance and date of the manuscript by comparing it with others. R. S. Loomis was the first to point out that there is a group of related cyclic manuscripts of the Arthurian legend in prose, of which ours is a part.[1] He connects it with two manuscripts in the British Museum, Add. MS. 10292-4, and Royal 14 E iii. If one compares the miniatures in the three manuscripts there is seen to be an indisputable connexion between them. The illustration of the *Divine Stag*[2] is almost exactly the same, except that in the Rylands MS. the stag is facing the left and in the others it faces the right. One of the most striking similarities is the decorated page at the beginning of the *Mort Artus* section. The Rylands MS. differs from the other two in that it represents the unusual situation of a standing king and a seated author; in the other two manuscripts the situation is reversed. The style of decoration is the same in all three, but it must not be forgotten that this alone does not indicate a connexion, for it was a fairly widespread one. There can, however, be no doubt that the miniatures of Henry and Map in all three were at least based on the same model. Probably the best example of similarity of miniatures is in the case of those which illustrate the story of the arrival of the ship bearing the body of the Fair Maid of Astolat at Camelot.[3] In the British Museum manuscripts the scene represented occurs rather later in the story than that in our manuscript. In the latter the miniature

[1] R. S. Loomis, *Arthurian Legends in Mediæval Art*. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, New York and London. Oxford University Press (1938) (Monograph Series), Pp. 97-8, Plates 237, 238, 240.

[2] Rylands Fr. 1, f. 90r°, col. i, Sommer, Vol. V, p. 277, l. 37: "Chi furent abatu lancelot et mordres ius de lor kevaus par .ij. chevaliers pour che que il sievoient le blanc chierf et les vi. lyons qui le conduisoient." *Vide* Loomis *op. cit.*, pl. 244.

[3] Rylands Fr. 1, f. 226r°, col. i. Sommer, Vol. VI, p. 256, l. 11: "Chi ariue la damoisiele descalot morte en vne nef deuant le chastel le roy artu et G. ala a la nef e le connut si vient apres mout biaus contes." This miniature has been reproduced in E. Vinaver's edition of *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, 3 vols. Oxford, 1947, vol. iii, p. 1576, as has the miniature on f. 224*v*°, col. ii. *Op. cit.*, p. 1610. *Vide* Loomis *op. cit.*, plates 241, 246, 247.

shows the king and two knights looking out of the window of the castle at the arrival of the ship. In the former the king and several courtiers are seen leaving the castle and approaching the riverside. Although the scenes are thus different there are certain very strong resemblances between the Rylands miniature and those in the two British Museum manuscripts. In all three the castle is on the right, and it is the same castle. There is, on the left, a small extension supported by a sloping beam ; then, the right, a cylindrical tower with a conical top, two squarish windows, between which there rises above the border of the picture what appears to be a flat-topped chimney. The castle is completed by another cylindrical, conical-topped tower on the right. The " barget " in which the lady is resting is in all three on the left of the picture. There can be no doubt that all are copied from the same model. The British Museum manuscripts were either copied the one from the other, or, more probably, both from a common source. The Rylands MS. was either copied from this source, or was itself the model for it. This latter seems the more natural hypothesis, as it is unlikely that an artist would alter the more dramatic scene, as painted in the British Museum manuscripts, to the one earlier in the story, as in the Rylands manuscript.

These, together with many other similar examples, show that there is undoubtedly a connection between the miniatures of all three. The fact that they are written in the same dialect of northern French indicates that they were not only illuminated in the one area, but also written there. In view of the fact that the Rylands MS. contains a series of adventures not found in the other two, it is impossible for it to have been copied from them. One outstanding difference is that the miniatures of the British Museum manuscripts are evenly spaced and fairly frequent, whereas in the Rylands MS. the distribution of miniatures is most irregular. This points to the fact that the Rylands MS. was not copied from a model with evenly spaced miniatures, but was perhaps an experimental copy for a new " edition " of the Vulgate cycle. That certain miniatures have been added at the foot of the page very shortly after the manuscript was completed suggests that it was intended that any copies made from this one

should contain more miniatures. Moreover, it is clear that the Rylands MS. was not copied from a source arranged exactly like itself, since there are copious instructions at the bottom of the page to the miniaturist. It thus becomes clear that our manuscript was made to a fresh pattern rather than copied slavishly from an already existing one. Since the two British Museum manuscripts contain miniatures very like those in our manuscript, but spaced at even intervals throughout the text, the only possible assumption is that they were copied from it, either directly or, more probably, through an intermediary. There is no linguistic objection to this hypothesis, as all are in a dialect of northern France and of approximately the same date.

Since British Museum Add. MS. 10292 can be dated by means of an inscription on a miniature on f. 55v°, as having been executed about 1316, this date may be considered as a *terminus ad quem* for our manuscript. It is impossible to discover a *terminus a quo* with any exactitude, but from considerations of language, illumination and palæography it would be unwise to date the manuscript earlier than the last decade of the thirteenth century, and all indications point to its having been executed in the first decade of the fourteenth.

Rylands French MS. 1 is, therefore, not only of great interest as a text of the Vulgate Cycle of Arthurian Romance, but also as a member, and probably the " founder ", of a family of manuscripts of that Cycle. Its interest is, however, wider, as it is of value in determining the methods by which manuscripts were constructed, and its importance is not simply Arthurian. Finally, as a work of art its beauties can be appreciated by all who love the illustrations of the medieval equivalent of the modern novel.

COURT ROLLS, RENTALS, SURVEYS AND ANALOGOUS DOCUMENTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.

By F. TAYLOR, M.A., Ph.D.,
KEEPER OF WESTERN MANUSCRIPTS IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.

THE calendar below comprises court rolls, court books, compotus rolls, rentals, surveys, terriers, and similar documents which the Library has acquired by purchase, donation, or deposit down to and including 1945; it is confined to manors, lands and property in England. These documents are scattered throughout several collections of widely differing size and provenance now preserved in the Charter Room and Manuscript Rooms, the following nineteen having yielded relevant material: the Latin MSS., English MSS., Nicholas Papers, Phillipps Charters and Rylands Charters and, among deposited groups, the Mainwaring MSS., Jodrell MSS., Supplementary Jodrell MSS., Tatton Deeds, Clowes Papers, Crutchley Deeds, Hatton Wood MSS., and collections entrusted to the Library's care by the Earl of Stamford, the Lords of the Honor of Clitheroe, the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, the British Records Association, the Norfolk Record Society, the Society of Genealogists and Miss E. Sadler. Not all these documents have as yet been dealt with in print, and even where this has been the case,[1] it has

[1] For Latin MSS. 1-183 see M. R. James's Catalogue (1921), for 184-395 M. Tyson's Hand-List (1928) and for 396-447 F. Taylor, *Supplementary Hand-List of Western MSS.* (1937), pp. 7-21. English MSS. 1-865 were described by Dr. Tyson in two Hand-Lists of 1929 and 1935, and 866-907 in Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-31. A Hand-List of the Mainwaring and Jodrell MSS. by R. Fawtier was published in 1923 and the Nicholas Papers and Phillipps Charters were listed by the same writer in 1925 in his *Hand-List of Charters, Deeds and Similar Documents in the Possession of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 1. Rylands Charters 1-2011 were listed by Tyson in Vol. 2 (1935) of the same series and 2012-2976 by Taylor in Vol. 3 (1937). Indexed Hand-Lists of Ryl. Ch. 2977-4779, Latin and English MSS. acquired after 1937, the Tatton Deeds, Clowes Papers, Legh of Booths Charters (part of the Hatton Wood MSS.), and Crutchley Deeds may be consulted in the Library pending publication, together with lists or card-indexes of most

often been possible below to give descriptions in rather more detail than was possible in the published Hand-Lists.

Manorial records form a comparatively high proportion of the items in the present calendar. Court rolls for over seventy manors in some fourteen counties are represented, in addition to suit rolls and jury presentments for several others, mainly in Cheshire. In particular may be mentioned the fine series of court rolls for Bourn Hall in Wherstead, Suffolk (thirteenth-eighteenth centuries), West Horsley, Surrey (fourteenth-eighteenth centuries), Longford, Derbyshire (fourteenth-seventeenth centuries), Sutton Frene, Herefordshire (fourteenth-sixteenth centuries), and for Lancashire manors under the jurisdiction of the Lords of the Honor of Clitheroe (fourteenth-nineteenth centuries). Among other early rolls are those for Halton in Cheshire (1392-1399), and Haddon (1394-1395, 1401-1403) and Newton Solney (1353-1354, 1403-1405, 1475), both in Derbyshire. Many other manors are represented by rolls, individual or in series, of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including Quedgeley, Whaddon and Frocester in Gloucestershire (sixteenth-seventeenth centuries), Goddlesford in Suffolk (1600-1717), and various manors of John Le Scrope in Yorkshire (1537) and Sir John Thynne in Wiltshire, Somersetshire and Gloucestershire (1568-1569). The earliest court roll listed below is for 1276 (Bourn Hall in Wherstead).

In addition to rolls a number of court books and presentment books also occur, the two earliest being for the manor, Hundred and Forest of Gillingham, Dorset (1469-1546), and for the manor of Over Peover, Cheshire (1497, 1508, 1510, 1681-1711); the latter is unfortunately imperfect. Other court books are those of Old Withington (1574-1583), Barnshaw and Goostrey (1653-1654), Baddiley (1665-1728), and Northenden (1667-1700), all in Cheshire, Prestwich (1560-1571), Barton (1692-1768), Hambleton (1748-1768), Penwortham (1780-1802), and Kirkby Ireleth (1757-1821) in Lancashire, Bottesford (1547-1689) in Lincolnshire, Framfield (1665-1675) in Sussex, and of the manor of

of the other groups mentioned above. Further information concerning the collections in the Charter Room will be found in Taylor, *The Charter Room in the John Rylands Library* (1947).

Austin's in Middleton (1694-1754) in Suffolk. Estreats of court rolls have also been included, as have extracts from proceedings at manor courts. The words " extract(s) from proceedings " are used here solely to describe records of surrenders and admissions of tenants, commonly known as " copies of court roll ". In cases where the original roll is not in the Library the " extract " is included in the body of the calendar ; otherwise it is given in a footnote.

A number of interesting account rolls of bailiffs, farmers and collectors of rents, most of them pre-1500, may also be noted. For Norfolk there are compotus rolls of East Carlton (1277-1278, 1406-1407), West Harling (1328-1378), Gasthorpe (1417-1418), Burnham Deepdale (1454-1455) and Ingham (1506), for Nottinghamshire similar rolls for the manors of Osberton (1397-1398) and Epperstone (14 Hen. IV-2 Hen. V), and for Lincolnshire a fine series for Scotter (1372-1544). With these may be mentioned the rolls of bailiffs and collectors for Urchfont (1448-1449, 1522-1526) in Wiltshire, held by St. Mary's Abbey, Winchester ; Longford (1492-1493, 1494-1495) and North Wingfield (1492-1493) in Derbyshire ; Cottingham (1523-1524) in Northamptonshire ; and various Cheshire, Leicestershire and Shropshire manors (19-20 Hen. VII). Rentals are particularly numerous and, although the majority are of the sixteenth, seventeenth or eighteenth century, a number date from the fifteenth. Among these are five for lands, etc., in Cheshire, including Knutsford Booths (1408), Over Peover and Baddiley (1425) and Lostock Gralam (1434) ; four, all of 1476, for Derbyshire (Barlborough, Hathersage, Longford and Newton Solney) ; and four for Lancashire, three relating to holdings of the Harringtons in Preston and one to Cockersand Abbey. Rentals of two other religious houses occur in copies, namely, of Thornton Abbey in Lincolnshire (1443) and the Priory of St. Peter and St. Paul at Ipswich (sixteenth century). Perhaps one of the most important items of this nature, however, is the bulky volume containing sixteenth and early seventeenth century rentals and surveys of the manor, town and lordship of Oswestry, which has the additional interest of having formerly been in the possession of Scipio Le Squyer, who was a Deputy Chamberlain of the

Exchequer from 1620 to 1659. Finally, the attention of local historians is drawn to the various surveys of Cheshire lands, notably those of the Tatton estates, and to the roll of the Macclesfield mayoralty court for 1404-1405.

The arrangement of the documents below follows the system adopted by the Library in its Hand-Lists of deeds and charters; that is, chronological within geographical. The running numbers from 1 to 335 have been introduced for indexing purposes only and are not the correct finding references. These are given within round brackets at the end of each item; e.g. for No. 128 the correct reference is Ryl. Ch. 749. Cross-references to modern spellings of place names will be found in the Index.

BERKSHIRE.

Faringdon, Great.

1. Extract from proceedings [1] at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron for the manor of Wadley. 7 Oct. 1650. (Ryl. Ch. 2081.)

Stanford in the Vale.

2. Extracts from proceedings at Courts Baron for the manor of Stanford. 12 Nov. 1696-31 March 1698. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 2073).

CHESHIRE.

General.

3. *Memorandum de summa recepta, videlicet de duabus partibus reddituum omnium terrarum et tenementorum in manibus feoffatorum Willelmi de Bromley existentis, videlicet pro termino Nativitatis Sancti Johannis Baptiste anno Regis Henrici sexti post conquestum decimo* [1432]. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (Mainw. Roll 2.)

4. Bailiffs' Accounts for various lands [2] in Cheshire, Leicestershire, and Shropshire, 19-20 Hen. VII. 29 ff. (Lat. MS. 383.)

5. *The rentall of the landes and hereditaments of Robert Tatton of Wythynshawe in the Counties of Chester and Flynt.* 24 Jan. 1558. Parchm. book, 31 ff. (Tatton 346.)

6. An extent of the Jodrell estate, 1714, 1715, 1731, 1737. 4 ff. (Jodrell Suppl. 59.)

7. *Rental of the estates* [3] *of Sir John Thomas Stanley, Bar^t., in the County and City of Chester for* 1781, *ending Ladyday* 1782. (Eng. MS. 1097, ff. 1-4.)

[1] Concerning Littleworth.

[2] Elmesthorp, Warmyngeham, Northrode, Blacon, Assheton, Wolaston, Les Yates de Cestr', Norton in Halez, Alden et Bromefelde cum membris, Moneslowe.

[3] Chester, Soss Moss, Nether Alderley, Over Alderley, Chorley, Anderton, Barnton, Golborn Bellow, Guilden Sutton, Tilston, Broxton, Stretton, Hyle Lake.

ASTON.

8. Estreats of fines and amercements at Courts Baron for the manor of Aston. 29 Oct. 1705, 8 Feb. 1714. (Ryl. Ch. 2021-22.)

9. Suit rolls and jury presentments for the same. June and Oct. 1722 (*ib.* 2023-24); Ap. and Nov. 1723 (*ib.* 2025-26); Ap. 1724 (*ib.* 2027); Nov. 1739 (*ib.* 2029); July 1743 (*ib.* 2030).

BADDILEY.

10. Court Book of the manor of Baddiley cum membris.[1] Nov. 1665-Nov. 1728. (Eng. MS. 701, ff. 1-125v°.)

BOLLIN FEE.

11. Jury lists and presentments for the manor and fee of Bollin. May 1647-Oct. 1666. 25 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 4311.)

12. Suit rolls for the manor and fee of Bollin cum Norcliffe, 1786-1799, 1802-1832. 6 vols. (*ib.* 4312-4317).

DISLEY.

13. Notes of *surveys of the common in Disley Stanlie belonginge unto the Longhurste.* c. 1634-1637. 12 ff. (Jodrell Suppl. 46*a*.)

ETCHELLS. See also NORTHENDEN.

14. *A true and perfect Survey of all the Tenements, Rents, Suites and Services in the Lordshipp of Etchells,*[2] 1670. (Tatton 342, ff. 75-200.) At the end are notes of rents for 1733 (ff. 202-203.)

15. *Survay of Etchels: Thomas Tatton, Esq^r^.* n.d. [mid-18th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 335).

16. *The present Rent of Tenants in Etchells.* Dec 1793. 1 f. (*ib.* 334).

17. Suit rolls for the manor of Etchells, 1827, 1837, 1847, 1852 (*ib.* 1178).

18. Jury presentments for the same, 1827-1848, 1850-1853 (*ib.* 1196).

GOOSTREY-CUM-BARNSHAW.

19. *Abstract out of Barnshaw Court Rolls touchinge Hulse.* 7 Hen. VII-29 Eliz. 4 ff. (Mainw. Papers 4.)

20. Court rolls of the manor and lordship of Barnshaw and Goostrey cum membris.[3] 24 Oct. 1616[4] (Mainw. Roll 16); 13 and 15 Jas. I (B.R.A. 447); 21 Oct. 1634 (Mainw. Roll 13); Oct. 1635-Oct. 1636, Oct. 1638[5] (*ib.* 14).

21. Court Book of the same.[3] May 1653-Ap. 1654. 9 ff. (Mainw. Papers 14.)

[1] Faddeley, Burland, Brindley.

[2] Northerden, Kenerday, Mooreside, Gatley, Heath Houses, Shadow Mosse and Balshawe, Woodhouse Lane, Pounsacke, Brounley Greene, Cross Acres, Sharston.

[3] Hulse, Plumley, Cranage, Lees, Over Tabley, Chelford.

[4] An extract from proceedings at this Court is now Mainw. Ch. 410.

[5] Not 1638-1639 as Fawtier. Certain other slips of dating in Dr. Fawtier's Hand-Lists have been silently corrected below.

22. Suit rolls and jury presentments for the same. May 1663-Oct. 1671. 29 ff. (*ib.* 355*a*).

23. *A Rentall of the fee farme, cheif and old rents belonging to ye Mannor of Barnshaw*[1] *for one halfe year ending at Michaelmas last, 1716* (*ib.* 32).

HALTON.

24. Court rolls of the manor of Halton. Ap. 1392-May 1399, parchm. roll, 1 m. (Ryl. Ch. 1664); May 1532-Oct. 1542, parchm., 5 mm. (*ib.* 1665).

25. Extracts from proceedings at Halton Halmote Court. 26 June 1537, 23 March 1602 (*ib.* 4528-29).

HENBURY.

26. *Thextent and clere yerely value of y^e^ mannour of Hendbury . . . taken by Richarde Harpur, Esquier.* 6 Sept. 1558. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 775).

HOOTON, ETC.

27. *Rentale reddituum domini Rowlandi Stanley, militis, in villis, hamletis et locis subsequentis.*[2] 24 Aug. 1592. Parchm. roll, 3 mm. (*ib.* 1681).

28. Roll of the Court Baron of the manor of Hooton. 21 Oct. 1652. Parchm. roll, 1 m. Attached are estreats of fines, etc., at Courts held there 21 Nov. 1649 and 6 May 1652. 2 ff. (*ib.* 1685).

29. Suit rolls and jury presentments for the same. 13 May 1685 (*ib.* 1692); 21 Oct. 1685 (*ib.* 1694); 18 Oct. 1688 (*ib.* 1696); 27 Ap. 1693 (*ib.* 1697); 16 Nov. 1693 (*ib.* 1698); 24 Oct. 1695 (*ib.* 1699); 2 Nov. 1698 (*ib.* 1700).

IRBY, ETC.

30. *Visus franciplegii cum Curia de Irreby, Grevesby, Wodechurche et Knoktirum' tenta apud Irreby,* 15 Oct. 1510. . . . *Visus franciplegii cum Curia de Brumbrugh' et Estham tenta apud Brumbrugh',* 23 Oct. 1510. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (B.R.A. 448).

KECKWICK.

31. Suit rolls and jury presentments for the manor of Keckwick. 7 Feb. 1714 (Ryl. Ch. 2056); 29 March and 5 Nov. 1723 (*ib.* 2057-58); 21 Ap. 1724 (*ib.* 2060); 6 Oct. 1739 (*ib.* 2061).

KNUTSFORD.

32. *Rentale Iohannis filii Jacobi de Legh de Knottesford Bothes.* 11 Nov. 1408. Parchm. 1 m. (Legh of Booths Ch. 55.)

33. Extent of the manors, lands, etc., of John Leighe, esq., son and heir of John Leighe, late of Norbury Bothes, kt. 1574 (*ib.* 136).

[1] Barnshaw, Hulse, Lees, Chelford, Astle.

[2] Hooton, Estham, Pulton and Spittelle, Bebington, Meales, Woodechurche, Tranmull', Childerthornton, Morton, Walezey, Thingwall, Bromboroughe, Stourton Magna et Parva, Bwerton, Woodbancke, Saughall, Mollington Banester, Shotwicke Parke Side, Pensby, Stanley in com. Staff., Upton.

34. Rental of Over Knuttesforde, Nether Knuttesforde, Moberley and Owlerton. n.d. [late 16th/early 17th cent.]. Parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 150).

35. An estreat of amercements at the Court Leet with Court Baron of Peter Legh, esq., for the manor of Over Knutsford. 26 Nov. 1753 (*ib.* 186).

36. Suit rolls for the manor of Over Knutsford with members.[1] 17 May 1749-29 June 1752, 8 July 1754-9 July 1759. Paper book, 8 ff. (*ib.* 187).

LOSTOCK GRALAM.

37. *Recepta redditus de Lostok' de termino Martini a^o xiij* [*Henrici sexti*]. 1434. Parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 190).

MACCLESFIELD.

38. Roll of the Mayor's Court, 6 Hen. IV [1404-1405], Roger Alcock being Mayor. Parchm. roll, 4 mm., last imperf. (Tatton 1184.)

39. *Rentalle domini Regis de redito suo infra forrestam de Macclesfeld anno regni Regis Edwardi* [sexti] *primo* [1547-1548].[2] Paper roll, 4 'skins' (Jodrell Suppl. 52*a*). With copy (*ib.* 52*b*).

40. Abstracts of *Rentes w^th in the Mannor and Forest of Macclesfeld due unto His Highnes.* n.d. [early 17th cent.]. 5 ff. (*ib.* 48, 49*b-c*, 53, 55).

41. Extracts[3] from proceedings at Halmotes of the Manor and Forest of Macclesfield, 18 Dec. 1363 (Jodrell 206); 6 Feb. 1364 (*ib.* 207); 25 Sept. 1364 (*ib.* 4); 8 March 1367 (*ib.* 235); 20 Dec. 1376 (*ib.* 7); 12 Ap. 1400 (*ib.* 19); 10 May 1400 (*ib.* 20); 17 Sept. 1403 (*ib.* 26); 12 March 1408 (Ryl. Ch. 802); 1368-1426[4] (Jodrell 6); 4 Oct. 1428 (*ib.* 35*a*); 2 July 1431 (*ib.* 236); 15 June 1529 (*ib.* 41, 44*b-c*); 20-21 Hen. VIII [1528-1530] (Jodrell Suppl. 396); 1606 (?) (*ib.* 28); 31 July 1620 (Jodrell 49*a*); 3 Nov. 1634 (Jodrell Suppl. 373); 28 Nov. 1636 (*ib.* 348, 351-352); 13 Dec. 1648 (*ib.* 363); 22 July 1650 (*ib.* 37); 31 July 1651 (*ib.* 36); 30 Jan. 1653 (*ib.* 39); 22 May 1654 (*ib.* 42); 8 Sept. 1656 (*ib.* 4); 19 Oct. 1657 (*ib.* 34); 12 May 1658 (*ib.* 35); 24 Nov. 1662 (Jodrell 142*a*); 19 Aug. 1664 (Jodrell Suppl. 64); 22 Aug. 1670 (*ib.* 63); 1 May 1671 (Jodrell 287); 22 July 1672 (*ib.* 288-289); 20 March 1682 (*ib.* 101*c*); 8 Sept. 1746 (Jodrell Suppl. 374, 376, 379); 21 Oct. 1811[5] (B.R.A. 828).

MORETON, GREAT.

42. Survey of *such part of the Trust Estate of Richard Vernon, Esq^r., deceased, as remained to be sold by John Crew, Esq^r. and Christopher Appleby, his Trustees,* 1727. Book of 19 ff. (ff. 8v^o-16, 17, 18, blank). (B.R.A. 579.)

43. Rental of the estates[6] of Edward Powys. 1765. 1 f. (*ib.* 608).

[1] Nether Knutsford, Sudlow, Ollerton, Mobberley, Rosthern, Bollington.

[2] Note at the end: "The originall of this copie was lent unto mee, James Jodrell, . . . by Thomas Shrigley . . . anno domini 1609."

[3] With one exception (see next note but one) they concern Yeardsley cum Whaley, Disley Stanley, and Kettleshulme.

[4] Parchment roll of 2 mm. [5] Concerning Hurdsfield and Rainow.

[6] Manor of Moreton, Odd Rode, Astbury, manor of Smallwood, Congleton, Buglawton, Birchton, Wheelock manor, Hassall manor.

MOTTRAM IN LONGDENDALE.

44. A survey of lands appertaining to Old Hall in Mottram in Longdendale parish belonging to Mr. Hollinworth, gentleman, by R. Wardleworth, surveyor, 1756-58. Paper book, 8 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 2373.)

45. A terrier of all the houses, lands and tithes belonging to the Rectory of Mottram. 1783. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2376).

NANTWICH.

46. Rental of the lands, tenements, etc., in Nantwich of John Maisterson, gentleman, deceased, *purchased of Margaret Stanley, widowe, doughter . . . of the said John, and of Thomas Stanley, Esquire, her sonne.* Jan. 1598/1599. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (Mainw. Roll 9.)

47. Record of proceedings at the Nantwich Hundred Court respecting the collection of subsidies granted to the King by Parliament, 18 Oct. 1641, parchm. roll, 1 m. (Mainw. Roll 15); 29 Feb. 1663/1664, paper roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 17).

NORTHENDEN, ETC.

48. *A survey of the Lo:pp of Northerden*[1] *of and belonginge to Robert Tatton, Esqr.* 3 March 1656. 27 ff. (Tatton 347*a*). With copy (*ib.* 347*b*).

49. *Rentall of the yearely Rents, with the suits and services payable in money . . . from the Tenaunts of the Lordshipps of Northerden and Etchells.*[2] 1660. 4 ff. (*ib.* 332).

50. *A perfecte Rentroule to be gathered by Henrye Cockson* [bailiff] *this Midsomer* 1662 *of the mannours of Ettchells and Northen.*[3] n.d. [contemporary true copy]. 1 f. (*ib.* 331).

51. *Survey of all the landes of the Freehoulders and theire subtenauntes in Northerden, Kenorday and Mooresyde.* 1666 (*ib.* 341, f. 2).

52. *A true and perfect account of what heriots, what ackers, what rents and what services are in money of the tenants of Northerden, Kenorday and Mooresyde.* 1666 (*ib.* f. 4).

53. *Survey of the Rents, suites and services of the Tenants in Northerden, Mooreside and Kenerday* [and Lauton Moore] *anno 1670* (*ib.* 342, ff. 3-57).

54. Survey of the lordships of Northenden and Etchells. 19 Jan. 1699. 6 ff. (*ib.* 337).

55. Court Book of the manor of Northenden. Ap. 1667-Nov. 1700. 113 ff. (*ib.* 339).

56. Survey of the lordships of Northenden and Etchells. 1708. 2 ff. (*ib.* 338*b*).

57. Rent Book of the Tatton estates. 1733-1747. 131 ff. (*ib.* 340).

58. Rent Book and Account Book of the Tatton estates. 1748-1767 (*ib.* 341, ff. 6-117).

[1] Withinshaw, Northerden, Kenworthie, Mooreside.

[2] Northerden, Kenworthey, Mooreside, Etchells, Sharston, Crosse akers, "in Stockport parish", Withinshawe.

[3] Sharston, "My parte of rents in Northen parish in Ettchells", "My parte of rents in Stopford parish", Northerden, Kenworthie, Mooreside.

59. *Free rents due to Wm. Tatton, Esq^r. from the Lordship*[s] *of Northenden* [and Etchells] *yearly.* n.d. [18th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 336).

60. Suit rolls for the manor of Northenden, 1827, 1837, 1847, 1852 (*ib.* 1195).

61. Jury presentments for the same, 1827-53 (*ib.* 1194).

OLLERTON.

62. *A Book of the Receipts and Distributions of the Rents and Profits of the Lands called Priest-Lands in Ollerton and the Old-Rents in Snelston, charitably given by Mr. Edward Acton, Chaplain.* 1726-42. 30 ff. (Mainw. Papers 358.)

PEOVER, OVER, ETC.

63. *Rentale de Overpever et Badyley.* 1425. Parchm., 3 mm. (Mainw. Rolls 1.)

64. *Recepcio reddituum omnium terrarum et tenementorum Johannis Maynwaring, militis, in Over Peover, Wythyngton et Knottesford.* 38 Hen. 6 [1459/1460]. Parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 3).

65. Court rolls of the manor of Peover.[1] July 1424-July 1430, parchm. roll, 1 m.; Dec. 1494-July 1502, 13 paper 'skins' (*ib.* 4).

66. Court Book of the manor of Peover. Imperf.; contains records of proceedings at Halmote Courts of Nov. 1497, July 1508, Dec. 1508 and Nov. 1510. 5 ff. (Mainw. Papers 1, 304.[2])

67. Rental of Mainwaring holdings in "Pever, Lostok, Toft, Plumley, Bexton, Lawer Knotisford, Wychmalbank, Baguley, Eddisley, Olerton, Whysturfyld, Old Wethyngton, Wenyngton, Eyton, Bugulaton, Hacusley, Badeley, Capenhurst, Chorley, Malpus, Egge, Larton, Bekerton, Aston, Althurst, Swanwik, Over Knotysford, Stoke, Alvaston, Miall', Pulton Lancelett, Upton." *c.* Nov. 1520. Parchm. roll, 7 mm. (Mainw. Roll 5.)

68. Estreats of fines and amercements at Courts Leet and Courts Baron for the manor of Over Peover, 9 July 1633 (*ib.* 11); 26 Nov. 1633 (*ib.* 12); 26 Nov. 1634 (Mainw. Ch. 424); 6 July 1636 (Mainw. Papers 11).

69. Court Book of the manor of Over Peover. July 1681-July 1711. (Eng. MS. 701, ff. 178-237 v°.)

70. Rent Book of the Peover Estate. 1743-1747. 51 ff. (Mainw. MS. Books 41.)

RUNCORN.

71. Extracts from proceedings at the Halmote of the manor of Runcorn. 20 March 1604 (Ryl. Ch. 4555); 22 Dec. 1607 (*ib.* 4556).

STOCKPORT.

72. Estreats of fines and amercements at the Court Leet and Court Baron. 28 Ap. 1796, 9 Oct. 1834. (Soc. Genealogists 25-26.)

[1] Also entered are records of Yayton Halmote for 1495 and 1499 and Withington Halmote for 1494 and 1495.

[2] Mainw. Papers 304 is a loose folio (Nov. 1510) of the same imperfect volume, inadvertently numbered separately by Dr. Fawtier.

STOKE.

73. Suit rolls and jury presentments for the manor of Stoke and Hapsford. 1738-1742, 1744, 1747-1753. (B.R.A. 1754.)

STYAL.

74. Rent Books for Styal and Dean Row. 1777-1815. 3 vols. (125 ff.). (Deposited by the Earl of Stamford.)

THURSTASTON.

75. *A Rental and Estimate of the Values of the several Lordships of Thurstaston, Heswall and Caldey.* Ap. 1767. (B.R.A. 1503.)

WARMINGHAM.

76. Free and farm rents for the manor of Warmyncham cum membris, Newton and Sutton, Northroade, Willaston, Blacon, Eastgate in Chester, Ashton, Crewe and Barthomley. n.d. [17th cent.]. (Mainw. Papers 342.)

WHARTON.

77. *The rentall of Wartonn.* n.d. [17th cent.]. 1 f. (Mainw. Papers 301).

WILMSLOW.

78. *Rentallye for the Right Worshippfull Edmund Trafford, Esquier, for the parish of Wilmeslowe.* 1592. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (Mainw. Roll 8.)

WIRRAL, HUNDRED OF.

79. Rental of Sir Rowland Stanley, kt., for the Hundred of Wirral. n.d. [temp. Eliz.]. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (Ryl. Ch. 1682). With a note of certain annual rents concerning the same (*ib.* 1454).

80. Similar rental. n.d. [late 16th cent.]. Parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 1341).

WITHINGTON, OLD.

81. Court rolls of the manor of Withington. 4 June 1562, 13 July 1564. Paper, 2 ' skins ' (imperf.). (Mainw. Papers 309.)

82. Court Book of the manor of Withington. Nov. 1574-July 1583. 35 ff. (imperf.) (*ib.* 312,[1] 2).

WYTHENSHAWE.

83. *A true and perfect Estimate of Robert Tatton of Withinshawe, Esqr., of his demesne of Withinshawe.* 1666. (Tatton 341, f. 3.)

84. Survey of Wythenshawe demesne. n.d. [early 18th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 338*a*).

YEARDSLEY CUM WHALEY.

85. *Yeardsley Rental.* 1770, 1771. 1 f. (Jodrell Suppl. 74).

86. *Auntient Rent.*[2] n.d. [18th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 395).

[1] Mainw. Papers 312 comprises two folios (Nov. 1574) of the same imperfect volume, inadvertently numbered separately by Dr. Fawtier.

[2] Yeardesley, Disley Stanley, Wealey.

87. *Valuation of the Yeardesley estate.* n.d. [18th cent.] 1 f. (Jodrell 301.)

88. *Yeardsley and Whaley Rental, with the property in Twemlow, Lower Withington, Davenport and Barnshaw.* n.d. [18th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 300).

DERBYSHIRE.

BARLBOROUGH.

89. *Barleburgh cum aliis:* [1] *Rentale renovatum ibidem in tempore Henrici Pierpoint, militis, Willelmi Ryley, et aliorum feoffatorum Nicholai Langforth', militis, coram Thoma Saperton', tunc senescallo.* 31 Oct. 1476. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (Crutchley 234c.)

HADDON.

90. *Curia Johannis de Barley tenta apud Haddon.* May 1394-May 1395, parchm. roll, 1 m.; Oct. 1401-Feb. 1403, parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 86).

HATHERSAGE.

91. *Hathersegge cum membris: Rentale renovatum ibidem in tempore Henrici Pierpoint, militis, Willemi Ryley, et aliorum feoffatorum Nicholai Langforth', militis, coram Thoma Saperton', senescallo ibidem.* 25 July 1476. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 234*b*).

92. Roll of the Great Court for the manor of Hathersage. 23 June 1547. Paper, 2 'skins' (*ib.* 91*b*).

LONGFORD.

93. *Langforth' cum membris:* [2] *Rentale renovatum ibidem Henrici Pierpoint, militis, W[illelmi Ryley, et aliorum] feoffatorum Nicholai Langforth', militis, coram Thoma Sap[erton', senescallo ibidem].* Wednes. next before the feast of [*torn*], 1476. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 234*d*).

94. *Compotus Petri Pole, ballivi et collectoris reddituum ibidem.* Christmas 1492-Christmas 1493. Paper roll, 1 'skin' (*ib.* 237*a*).

95. *Compotus domini Henrici Longforth', ballivi et collectoris reddituum ibidem.* Christmas 1494-Christmas 1495. Paper roll, 1 'skin' (*ib.* 238).

96. Rolls of the Great Court of Longford. May 1367-Nov. 1376, parchm., 15 mm. (*ib.* 210); May 1386-2 Hen. IV, parchm., 16 mm. (*ib.* 216); Nov. 1401-June 1412, parchm., 8 mm. (*ib.* 217); June 1415-Nov. 1419, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 218); Ap. 1478-March 1482, paper, 6 'skins', (*ib.* 235); Ap. 1536, June 1539, Sept. 1545-Sept. 1546, Nov. 1554, May 1559, Ap. 1561-Ap. 1562, May 1564, June 1581, Aug. 1595-Nov. 1599, Ap.-Dec. 1601, paper, 25 'skins' (*ib.* 276).

97. *A Rentall of the demeanes of Langford, the quantety of Acres, and the Yerely Valew, the names of every Tennant belonging to the Mannor, with the Rentes reserved upon theire Leases.* n.d. [early 17th cent.]. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 275).

98. Estreats of fines and amercements at the Court Baron of Longford. March and Oct. 1625, paper, 2 'skins' (*ib.* 310); 1649-1654, paper, 10 'skins' (*ib.* 332).

[1] Whetewell', Kynwalmershe, Dukmanton'.

[2] Bubdon, Malmarton', Holyngton', Shirley, Roddesley.

99. *A note of Longford rents.* n.d. [c. 1731]. 1 f. (*ib.* 439).

100. Survey of the manors of Longford, co. Derby, Bourn Hall, Wherstead Hall Farm and Pannington Hall, co. Suffolk, and other Suffolk properties of the Coke family.[1] Book of 18 ff. n.d. [18th cent.]. (*ib.* 471).

NEWTON SOLNEY.

101. *Neweton Sulny : [Rentale renova]tum ibidem Henrici Pierpoint, militis, Willelmi Ryley, et aliorum [feoffatorum Nichola]i Langforth', militis, coram Thoma Saperton, senescallo ibidem.* [day *torn*] June 1476. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 234*a*).

102. Rolls of the Great Court of Newton Solney, Sept. 1353-June 1354, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 543); June 1403-Ap. 1405, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 544); Nov. 1475, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 547); Ap. 1577, June-Oct. 1588, paper, 4 'skins' (*ib.* 553).

ROSLISTON.

103. Extract from proceedings at the Court of Gerard Ufflete, kt., and Elizabeth, his wife. 9 Aug. 1415. (Phillipps Ch. 229.)

SUTTON.

104. Rental of Sutton, 1681-82. With notes of arrears of rents in Sutton, Burnaston', Thurvaston and Etwall. 4 ff. (Clowes 1155.)

WINGFIELD, NORTH.

105. *North Wynfeld' cum aliis maneriis :*[2] *Compotus Johannis Foliambe, ballivi et collectoris ibidem.* Christmas 1492-Christmas 1493. Paper roll, 1 'skin'. (Crutchley 237*b*.)

DEVON.

106. *Thextente and clere yerelye value of all the mannors, messuages, lands, tenements, and hereditaments late of John Pincombe, gentleman, deceased . . . w^ch^ ben discended . . . unto John Pincombe the younger, his sonne and next heire.* 3 Ap. 1605. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (Ryl. Ch. 2890.)

DORSET.

GILLINGHAM.

107. Court Book of the manor, Hundred and Forest of Gillingham. Dec. 1469-March 1546. 164 ff. (Nicholas Papers 64.)

108. Book of 16 ff. containing 17th cent. copies of: *The perambulacon of Gillingham Forreste and Parke,* citing at length *the rowle of perambulacon* of 28 Edw. I (ff. 2-6v°.); *The mannor of the woode court* (ff. 7-8); an extract from

[1] Tattingston Farm, premises in Wherstead, the manor house of Godlesford.

[2] Barleburgh', Whitwoll', Kynwalmersh, Dukmanton', Pyllysley and Morton', Normanton' and Pynkeston', Blakwell, Wyngurworth', Oreby and Southwyllyngham, Boythorp', Hathirsegge.

a Survey of Gillingham Forest, 22 Aug. 1547 (f. 8v°.); *The mannor of Gillingham . . . parcell of the Joynture of the Queenes of England* (ff. 9-10); *The custome of the Queenes Ma^ties mannor of Gillingham* (ff. 10v°.-12) (*ib.* 65).

109. *An Accompte of the Mannor of Gillingham. Anno* 1° *Eliz.* [1558/1559]. 5 ff. 17th cent. copy (*ib.* 67).

110. Extract from a Court held at Gillingham, 14 Dec. 1574, respecting "the boundes of our Lady the Queene called the Queens Lanchard". 1 f. (*ib.* 85, no. 6).

111. Extracts from presentments at Gillingham Manor Court, 1406, 1442, 1489, 1563, 1565, 1567, June and Oct. 1571, 1584, 1586, Feb. and Ap. 1588. 12 ff. Certified copies, made 1655. 12 ff. (*ib.* 80, nos. 1-12).

112. *A Survey of the Mannor of Gillingham . . . done by Gilbert Thacker,* 26 Sept. 1608. 82 ff. (*ib.* 87).

113. *A Survey of the coppiehould tennants within the Mannor of Gillingham, a particular of the landes every tennant houldeth, and the content of acres and value of each particular, taken by Gilbert Thacker, Anno* 6^to *Jacobi Regis.* [1608/1609]. 77 ff. (*ib.* 88).

114. Extracts from the following records "in the Augmentation Office" concerning the manor of Gillingham: a Rental of 1527, a Compotus of 3 Edw. VI, a Survey of 1608, Court Records (amercements) of 1565-1624. Certified copies, made 1655. 10 ff. (*ib.* 80, nos. 13-22).

115. *A Rentall* [of Gillingham manor] *made and certefyed by John Wollridge, the nowe deputye Bayliffe, . . . of all the Rents, as well free as customerye, nowe payable to the Princes Highnes yearly.* 28 Oct. 1624. Book of 9 ff. (*ib.* 66).

116. *The Orders of the Courte of the Mannor of Gillingham* [1611-1637] (ff. 1-5), with *The boundarie of the same Mannor taken and presented by the Tennants and Bayliffe* (ff. 5v°.-9). *Sent upp by M^r Brunker to yo^r S.H. with his letters in January* 1638 (*ib.* 69).

117. *Gillingham and Motcombe: Rentall for the halfe yeare ended at Lady day* 1699. 1 f. (*ib.* 75, no. 3).

118. Rental of *M^r Nicholas's Moyety of y^e Prebend Mannor of Gillingham.* 1701. 2 ff. (*ib.* 82, nos. 5-6).

119. Accounts of John Lush of the rents and profits of the Prebend Manor of Gillingham. 1701, 1702. 2 ff. (*ib.* 82, nos. 3, 16).

120. Extracts from proceedings at the Prebend Court. 24 March 1722. 1 f. (*ib.* 82, no. 4).

LANGTON.

121. *A brief Account of y^e Lands, Rights and Priviledges belonging to the Estate and Mannour of Langton.*[1] n.d. [18th cent.] (*ib.* 85, no. 4).

ESSEX.

BARKING.

122. Extract from proceedings at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron. 16 Ap. 1617. (Hatton Wood, Ess.)

[1] Near Long Blandford.

BOXTED.

123. Extract from proceedings at a special Court Baron for the manor of Rivers Hall in Boxted. 12 June, 1682 (*ib.*).

SNOREHAM.

124. Extract from proceedings at a Court of the manor of Snoreham. 20 Oct. 1483 (*ib.*).

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

QUEDGELEY, ETC.

125. Court rolls of the manor of Quedgeley. Oct. 1575-Ap. 1580. Parchm., 3 mm. (Ryl. Ch. 1765.)

126. Court rolls of Quedgeley, Whaddon and Frocester. Jan.-Ap. 1610, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 1766); Dec. 1610-March 1611, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 1767); Dec. 1611-Ap. 1612, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 1768); 26, 27 and 28 Ap. 1614, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 1769); Ap., July and Oct. 1615, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 1770); March 1619-March 1620, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 1771); Ap. and Sept. 1629, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 1772); 10 and 11 Oct. 1632, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 1773); May 1639-Oct. 1640, parchm., 5 mm. (*ib.* 1774).

HEREFORDSHIRE.

SUTTON FRENE.

127. Court rolls of the manor of Sutton Frene. March 1386-July 1395, parchm., 1 m. (Phillipps Ch. 5*a*); Dec. 1405, Jan.-Oct. 1409, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*b*); Feb. 1406-Nov. 1407, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*c*); Ap. 1410-Dec. 1413, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*d*); May 1415-June 1418, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*e*); Sept. 1422, Jan. 1428-March 1430, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5 f.); Ap. 1444, Ap. 1445, Ap. 1447, May 1448, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*g*); 28 Oct. 1454, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*h*; also recorded in part on 5*i*, paper, 1 'skin'); March 1539, Sept. 1548, Dec. 1551, Nov. 1563, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*j*); Ap. 1550-Ap. 1552, March 1563, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 5*k*).

WIGMORE.

128. *Wyggemore Honor : Curia magna tenta ibidem quinto die mensis Aprilis anno regni Henrici vj*^{ti} *decimo* [5 Ap. 1432]. Parchm., 1 m. (imperf.) (Ryl. Ch. 749.)

HUNTINGDONSHIRE.

ABBOTSLEY.

129. Extract from proceedings at a Court for the manor of Abbotsley. 24 Oct. 1776 (*ib.* 1857).

PAXTON, GREAT.

130. Extracts from proceedings at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron of the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln for the manor of Great Paxton, 16 Ap. 1675, 21 Oct. 1679, 7 May 1680 (*ib.* 1914); 22 Oct. 1684 (*ib.* 1915); 6 Nov. 1722 (*ib.* 1920-22).

ST. NEOTS.

131. Extract from proceedings at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron for the manor of St. Neots. 17 Ap. 1682 (*ib.* 1925).

LANCASHIRE.

GENERAL.

132. A survey of Towneley lands in Lancashire. n.d. [1641]. 12 ff. (Norfolk Record Soc. 16.)

133. *A Servay of the lands late Charles Townley, Esq^r., in the County of Lancaster.* 12 July 1654. 3 ff. (*ib.* 17). With contemporary copy, containing alterations and additions. 3 ff. (*ib.* 18).

134. A survey of Towneley lands in Lancashire.[1] n.d. [17th cent.]. 2 ff. (*ib.* 19). With contemporary copy, containing alterations and additions. 3 ff. (*ib.* 20).

135. *Lancashire Rental* [2] [of the Legh family]. 1764. (B.R.A. 913, ff. 4v°.-26v°.)

136. *A Survey of all the Lands, Tenements and Hereditaments in the County of Lancaster* [3] *late belonging to Edward Chetham of Castleton, Esq^r., deceased.* 1770. 36 ff. (Eng. MS. 704.)

137. *Madam Anne Legh's Cheshire and Lancashire Rental.*[4] 1772-1783. (B.R.A. 914, ff. 1v°.-35 *passim.*)

138. *Madam Anne Legh's Rental for her New Inclosed Estate.*[5] 1772-1784. (*ib.*, ff. 37v°.-49v°.)

ASPULL, ETC.

139. *A Rental of Sir Jn°. Smith's Estates.* 1796-1797. 1 f. (B.R.A. 1473.)

140. Rentals of the estates of Sir John Smith, bart., in Aspull, Adlington, Blackrod, Croft and Elswick. 1801-1804, 1 f. (*ib.* 1474); 1804-1807, 1 f. (*ib.* 1471).

141. *Survey of Sundry Estates in the County Palatine* [6] *. . . belonging to Sir John Smith.* n.d. [early 19th cent.] (*ib.* 1523).

BALDERSTONE, ETC.

142. Notes of chief rents, mostly due to Edward Chetham, Esq., from Balderstone, Ashworth, and Cripplegate in Rochdale parish, together with receipts for the same. 1675-1750 *passim.* 25 items. (Clowes 68.)

[1] Cleveger, Hurstwood, Worsthorne, Line Rood, Pendle, Hapton, Nuttshaw.

[2] Ashton, Ayke Bank, Bold, Billinge, Burtonwood, Bleakley, Eccleston, Fearnhead, Dalton, Golborne, Haydock, Hindley, Hoole, Lawton, Newton, Orford, Poulton, Pemberton, Parr, Sankey, Warrington.

[3] Salford, Pendlebury, Broughton, Kersall, Chetham, Crumpsall, Spotland, Newton, Droylsden, Failsworth, Manchester, Turton, Moston.

[4] Disley, Grappenhall, Hanley, Lyme, Norbury [Cheshire], Golborne, Orford, Parr, Warrington [Lancs.].

[5] Golborne, Lowton, Hoole, Newton.

[6] Aspull, Adlington, Blackrod, Croft, Elswick, and coal mines.

BARTON.

143. Court book of the manor of Barton. Ap. 1692-June 1768. 163 ff. (Eng. MS. 295.)

BOLTON WITH ADGARLEY.

144. Extracts from proceedings at the manor court of Bolton with Adgarley. 9 May 1741 (1), 15 Dec. 1741 (3), 16 Oct. 1766 (12). 16 items. (Ryl. Ch. 3416.)

CARLETON.

145. Extract from proceedings at the Court Baron for the Manor of Carleton. 19 Oct. 1717 (*ib.* 344).

CLITHEROE, HONOR OF.

146. Court records of the manors of Chatburn, Worston and Pendleton, Accrington (Old and New), Ightenhill (including Pendle), Tottington, Colne and Trawden, and of the Wapentake of Blackburn. 398 rolls and 39 folio vols. (Deposited by the Lords of the Honor of Clitheroe). As follows :

(a) *Chatburn, Worston and Pendleton.* Feb., May and Sept. 1377 (Roll 1a), Nov. 1650-May 1660 (*ib.* 133-42), Ap. 1702-May 1707 (*ib.* 236) ;[1] *Accrington.* Oct. 1650-May 1660 (*ib.* 173-84), Oct. 1702-May 1707 (*ib.* 240) ;[2] *Colne.* Oct. 1650-May 1660 (*ib.* 143-52), Oct. 1702-Ap. 1707 (*ib.* 237) ; *Ightenhill.* Oct. 1650-May 1660 (*ib.* 153-62), Oct. 1702-Ap. 1707 (*ib.* 238) ;[3] *Pendle.* Oct. 1650-May 1660 (*ib.* 163-72), Oct. 1702-July 1707 (*ib.* 239) ; *Tottington.* Oct. 1650-May 1660 (*ib.* 185-93), Oct. 1702-May 1707 (*ib.* 241) ;[4] *All Manors.* Nov. 1495[5] (*ib.* 2a), Ap. 1496[6] (*ib.* 3a), May 1498[6] (*ib.* 4a), May 1504[7] (*ib.* 5a), Jan.-June 1507 (*ib.* 6a), Oct. 1507-May 1508 (*ib.* 7a), Oct. 1508-Ap. 1509 (*ib.* 8a), Oct. 1515-May 1650 (*ib.* 1-132), Oct. 1660-May 1702 (*ib.* 194-235), Oct. 1707-Feb. 1733 (*ib.* 242-286), Easter 1733-Nov. 1825 (39 folio vols.) ; (b) *Wapentake of Blackburn,* Oct. 1528-Sept. 1781 *passim* (104 rolls).

[1] Extracts from proceedings at Courts for this manor occur in Jodrell 239-40, 243-44, 246-47, 250-52, 256 (Dec. 1598-Ap. 1670 *passim*), and Soc. Genealogists 61-74 (*temp.* Hen. VIII-1820).

[2] Records for 1654-56 are wanting. Extracts from proceedings at Courts for this manor occur in B.R.A. 384-85, 387-93, 395-97, 399-400, 402-405, 407-12, 414-18, 420-31, 433 (Oct. 1736-Oct. 1823 *passim*), Ryl. Ch. 2891, 2933, 2935, 2939, 2942, 3582-84, 3586-87, 3589-92 (June 1551-Oct. 1810 *passim*), and Lancs. and Chesh. Ant. Soc., 1-3 (Ap. 1726, Ap. 1741, June 1813).

[3] Extracts from proceedings at Ightenhill Halmote in Oct. 1637 and Oct. 1689 occur in Ryl. Ch. 458 and Legh of Booths Ch. 18, respectively.

[4] Extracts from proceedings at Tottington Halmote occur in Clowes 1160 (Ap. 1652) and 1162 (May 1669) and Ryl. Ch. 640-41, 643-47, 649-54 (May 1664-March 1775 *passim.*).

[5] Accrington, Colne, Ightenhill.

[6] Chatburn, Worston and Pendleton, Accrington, Colne and Ightenhill.

[7] Chatburn, Worston and Pendleton, Accrington, Colne and Tottington.

COCKERSAND ABBEY.

147. *Rentale omnium firmarum, reddituum et serviciorum domus de Cokirsande, factum per fratrem Willelmum Lucas, cellerarium.*[1] 1451-1457. Parchm. roll, 4 mm. (imperf.) (Latin MS. 400.)

CROMPTON, ETC.

148. Rentals of Crompton, Flossehouses, Notehurst and Assheworthe. 1520-1535, parchm. roll, 8 mm. (Clowes 286); 1536-46, parchm. roll, 5 mm. (*ib.* 287).

149. *A Rentall boke, belonggyng to me John Chetham, of all my landes*[2] *except the turbarie, made in a° viij° Elizabethe Regine* [1565/66]. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. On dorso: *Renttys dewe in Manchester* and *Renttys goyng forth of certayne lands in Manchester*, 1572 (*ib.* 294).

DALTON IN FURNESS, ETC.

150. Extracts from proceedings at the Court Baron for the manor of Plain Furness, 14 Oct. 1723, 10 May 1740. 2 items (Ryl. Ch. 3418).

151. Extracts from proceedings at the Court Baron for the manor of Dalton, 13 May 1749 (*ib.* 3417).

FURNESS.

152. Extracts from proceedings at the Court Leet for the manor of Muchland. 13 May 1625-24 Nov. 1711 (*ib.* 1965-1992).

HAMBLETON.

153. Court Book of the manor of Hambleton, 4 May 1748-27 Oct. 1768. 70 ff. (ff. 57v°-70, blank). (Lancs. and Cheshire Ant. Soc. 21.)

HEATON.

154. *Heaton Rents paid by Mr. Parker to Wm. Egerton, Esq., prior to 16th of Nov.* 1793. (Eng. MS. 826, ff. 14-15.)

HOUGHTON.

155. Rental of the estate of Nicholas Wadsworth, esq. 1690. 2 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 2621.)

HUNDERSFIELD, ETC.

156. Rental of Towneley estates in Hundersfield, Spotland and Butterworth. *c.* 1763-1786. (B.R.A. 693.)

KIRKBY IRELETH.

157. Presentment Book of the manor of Kirkby Ireleth. May 1757-June 1821. 103 ff. (Eng. MS. 1100.)

[1] Cf. the similar rentals printed in Farrer, *The Chartulary of Cockersand Abbey*, vol. iii, part iii (Chetham Soc., N.S. 64), pp. 1232 sqq.

[2] Crompton, Frowsshe howsys, Nuthurst, Ashworth.

LANGLEY.

158. *Langley Rental*, 1711-14, 1718-20, 1721-28. (Sadler MS. 1, ff. 1v°-7, 11v°-18v°.)

LAYTON, etc.

159. *A particuler* [of rents] *of the estate*[1] *late of S^r. Alex^r. Rigby, kn^t., deceased*, n.d. [early 18th cent.]. Paper book, 4 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 492.)

LEYLAND.

160. Lease rents and chief rents in Leyland, 1795-98, and Penwortham, 1795-98, 1817. 5 ff. (Lancs. and Cheshire Ant. Soc. 40.)

161. Jury lists and suit rolls for the manor of Leyland, 25 Oct. 1824-13 Oct. 1828, 21 Oct. 1833 (*ib.* 23).

MANCHESTER.

162. *A Rentall boke pro terris Johannis Chetham.* 14 Eliz. [1571/1572]. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (Entered on dorso of Clowes 294.)

163. *The Survey of Newton, breviated per Ed. Shack.*[2] n.d. [c. 1684]. (Clowes 863.)

164. Rental of the lands of Edward Chetham, Esq., in Manchester, Moston, Failsworth, Droylsden, Kersal, Crumpsall and Newton. 1767. 1 f. (*ib.* 702).

165. *A Rentall of my* [Samuel Clowes'] *Estate in Town and Country*, 1769. 1 f. (*ib.* 704a).

166. A similar rental of *my Lands in Town and when due*, 1770-1771. 1 f. (*ib.* 704b).

MOSTON.

167. *A Perticuler of y^e Chiefe Rent paid out of Moston . . . and Botherstone* [to John Chetham]. 1677, 1683. Parchm. roll, 1m. (*ib.* 821).

PENWORTHAM.

168. An estreat of fines and amercements imposed at Courts Leet and Courts Baron for the manor and fee of Penwortham. Ap.-Oct. 1779. 4 ff. (Lancs. and Chesh. Ant. Soc. 35.)

169. Orders from the Steward of the above manor and fee to the Constables. 2 Oct. 1780, 2 Oct. 1786 (*ib.* 36-37).

170. Court Books of the above manor and fee. Ap. 1780-Mich. 1786, Easter 1789-Mich. 1802. 33 paper books (113 ff.) (*ib.* 38).

171. *Penwortham Court Call Books.* 1781-83, 1787-1803. 6 paper books (48 ff.) (*ib.* 39).

172. Extracts from proceedings at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron for the manor and fee of Penwortham, 19 Oct. 1726 (*ib.* 28); 28 June

[1] Manor of Layton, Duxbury, manor of Chorley, Bispham, manor of Coppull, Poulton, Carleton, Marton, Hardhorn cum Newton, Lancaster, Warbreck.

[2] Newton, Kirkemanshulme, Manchester and Salford.

1727 (*ib.* 29); 29 Apr. 1735 (*ib.* 31); 29 Sept. 1737 (*ib.* 32); 21 Oct. 1767 (*ib.* 33); 4 Jan. 1777 (*ib.* 34); 9 May 1821 (*ib.* 41); 7 June 1831 (*ib.* 42); 11 Nov. 1845 (*ib.* 43); 1847 (*ib.* 44); 19 Jan. 1849 (*ib.* 45); 26 May 1853 (*ib.* 47).

PRESTON, ETC.

173. *Rentale domini Jacobi Haryngton', militis.*[1] 11 Nov. 1494. On the dorso, a rental of tenements whereof his sister Lady Isabel Haryngton was enfeoffed, 11 Nov. 1498. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (Ryl. Ch. 1759.)

174. Preston: Rental of James Haryngton, kt. n.d. [late 15th cent.]. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 1760).

175. Memorandum of *certeyn parcelles of rent receyved by the handes of Willelmi Barbour of Preston' of certen lande of Sir William Haryngton' in Preston'*. n.d. [late 15th cent.]. Paper roll, 1 'skin' (*ib.* 1761).

176. *A Rental of Lands, etc. in Preston belonging to M^r: Will: Assheton and Mary, his wife,* 1771. Parchm. 1 m. (*ib.* 575).

PRESTWICH.

177. Court Book, containing records of courts held at Prestwich and Reddish before John Reddish, esq. (Dec. 1560-Nov. 1568), his widow Margaret (23 Nov. 1568), and Richard Holland (June 1570-July 1571). Dec. 1560-July 1571. 38ff. (Crutchley 586). At the end is a *Rentalle for the charterers and tenaunts of William Kennyon.*

REDDISH.

178. *Extent of the lands of John Reddish of Reddish, esq., deceased.* n.d. [c. 1568/69]. 1 f. (Crutchley 656.)

179. Rental of Reddish, Crumpsall, Prestwich, Pendlebury and Tetlow, Dec. 1590-Jan. 1622. n.d. [early 17th cent.]. Parchm. roll, 4 mm. (*ib.* 679).

ROCHDALE.

180. Extracts from proceedings[2] at Rochdale manor courts. March 1595-Oct. 1612. Paper, 6 'skins'. (Clowes 1100.)

181. The same.[3] March 1628-Oct. 1688. (Ryl. Ch. 2951-56, 2958-61.)

182. *Rents in Roch Dale and Middleton.* 1697. 1 f. (Clowes 1101.)

SMEDLEY (CHEETHAM).

183. *Survey of Smedley demesne.* 1769. (Clowes 212.)

WAVERTREE.

184. Extract from proceedings at the Halmote Court of the manor of Wavertree, 28 May 1740. (Ryl. Ch. 4590.)

[1] Dynkley, Elliston', Haghton', Brokys Bonke, Preston', Bretherton, Ormyskyrke, Walton, Chorley, Blakerode, Turton, Hendeley, Westley, Penyngton', Pulton'.

[2] Concerning Hundersfield, Spotland and Blackstone Edge.

[3] All concerning Spotland.

LINCOLNSHIRE.

General.

185. Miscellaneous extracts from Lincolnshire Court Rolls,[1] Hen. VII-Hen. VIII. Copied, c. 1860, by Edward Peacock. (Eng. MS. 248, ff. 1-39.)

186. A Lincolnshire rental,[2] lacking title and date [temp. Eliz.]. Copied in 1860 by Edward Peacock from " a trewe copye . . . remayninge in the hands of S^{r}. Rob^{t}. Tyrwhitt, knighte." (*ib.* 247, ff. 1-28v^{o}).

187. *An Extent of all the manors of the late Henry Welbye, esq., inherited by his daughter Elizabeth, Lady Hildyard.* 1637. Parchm. 1 m. (imperf.). (Ryl. Ch. 2791.)

Alford.

188. Rental for the manors of Alford and Well. n.d. [mid.-17th cent.]. 1 f. Copy. Endorsed : *Lord Lyndsay* (*ib.* 2478).

Amcotts.

189. Extracts from a rental of Amcotts, 16th cent. Made by Edward Peacock, 1884, from the original, then in the possession of E. W. C. Amcotts, Esq., of Hackthorn, co. Linc. (Eng. MS. 131, f. 38.)

Ashby.

190. A terrier of land in Ashby sold by William Lightfoot to William Clarke, 1649. Paper roll, 2 ' skins '. (Ryl. Ch. 3009.)

Bardney.

191. A particular of farm rents in Osgerby Daris in Bardney parish. 29 Ap. 1661. 1 f. (*ib.* 2485).

192. Extent of lands of James Host sold to Ed. Atkyns, 1676. 1 f. (*ib.* 2498).

Barrow.

193. *Rentale domini Abbatis de Thornton super Humbere, scriptum per Johannem Brawby, tunc Subbursarium . . . anno domini* 1443. Transcribed by Edward Peacock, 1860. (Eng. MS. 247, ff. 35-44.)

Barrowby.

194. *The Rentall for Mich^{mas}* and *Discharg of Mich^{mas} Rents.* 1666. 2 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 2505.)

[1] Aslokhowe, Coryngham, Manley, Kirketon Veneris, Misne, Bromby, Pilham, Spitell, Askeby, Est Butterwyk, Saxby, Kirketon Sabbati, Burynghame, Wyntertton, Northrope, Burton.

[2] Goxhill, Thornton, Halton, Killingham, Ulceby, Wotton, Ouresby, Barton super Humbr', Crosbye, Rowston, Habrough, Stallingbrough, Brokelesby, Rothwell, Kelstron, Gresby, Toftnewton, Lincoln, Aylisby, Laceby, Burn, Croxton, Elsham, Barrowe, Owmebye, Swallowe, Caborne, Whittyn, Magna Lymbergh, Seirebye, Carlton iuxta Bassingham.

BELLEAU, ETC.

195. A rental of Belleau, Aby and Swaby for the year ending Ladyday 1663. 1 f. (*ib.* 2507).

BISCATHORPE.

196. *Mr. Compton's perticuler of Biskerthorpe Rentes.* 1662. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2514).

BITCHFIELD.

197. Survey of the manor and parsonage of Bitchfeild. n.d. [c. 1666]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2518).

BOLINGBROKE.

198. *A Rentall of Bullingbroke for Mr.* [*Robert*] *Clayton.* n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2520).

BOTTESFORD.

199. Court Book of the manor of Bottesford. Sept. 1547-Ap. 1689. 63 ff. (Lat. MS. 336.)

BOUGHTON.

200. Rental of Mr. Rooe's estate at Boughton. n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 1 f. (Ryl. Ch. 2523.)

BRANSTON.

201. A particular of rents of the manor of Branston. 1652. 1 f. (*ib.* 2524).

BUCKNALL.

202. Lord Willoughby's *Perticuler of the Mannor of Bucknall wth the value of Acres and yearely rent as itt is now letten.* 1660. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2525).

BUTTERWICK.

203. *Rotulus omnium terrarum pertinentium hundredo de Boterwyk.* n.d. [c. 1450]. 16th cent. copy. Book of 6 ff. (Lat. MS. 446.)

CARLTON, LITTLE.

204. Miscellaneous extracts from Compotus Rolls (22 Rich. II-14 Edw. IV) and Court Rolls (4 Hen. V, 4 Hen. VI, 30 Hen. VI, 14 Hen. VII, 1 Hen. VIII -1655) of Little Carlton. Copied by Edward Peacock, 1884, from the originals, then in the possession of E. W. C. Amcotts, Esq., of Hackthorn, co. Linc. (Eng. MS. 131, ff. 1-26, 29-37.)

CAWKWELL.

205. A particular of Cawkwell rents. n.d. [late 17th cent.]. 2 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 2536.)

CLAYTHORPE.

206. A rental of the manor of Claythorpe. n.d. [*c.* 1671]. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2537).

COLSTERWORTH.

207. A rental of lands belonging to Mr. Alchorne. 1668. 1 f. (*ib.* 2538).

208. A rental of lands belonging to William Johnson. n.d. [late 17th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2540).

CRANWELL.

209. *A Perticuler* [sc. Rental] *of my* [William Thorold's] *Mannour of Cranwell.* n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2541).

DEEPING FEN.

210. Rental of a parcel of ground in Deeping Fen belonging to the Earl of Berkshire. n.d. [*c.* 1670]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2543).

DONINGTON.

211. A rental of James Raven's lands at Donington. 1663. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2544).

212. Survey of the manor of Wykes in Donington. n.d. [*c.* 1670]. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2546).

DUNSTON.

213. An extent of Dunston *for Mr. Abbatt.* 10 Dec. 1656. 1 f. (*ib.* 2547).

EPWORTH.

214. A particular of rents of the manor of Epworth. 1675. 2 ff. With copy (*ib.* 2550).

FISHTOFT.

215. Extents of the manor of Fishtofte. n.d. [mid-17th cent.], 1 f. (*ib.* 2551) and 1680, 2 ff., imperf. (*ib.* 2555).

FRISKNEY.

216. Notes from Court Rolls of Friskney, 5 Phil. and Mary-3 Eliz. Copied by Edward Peacock, 1884, from the originals, then in the possession of E. W. C. Amcotts, Esq., of Hackthorn, co. Linc. (Eng. MS. 131, ff. 27-28.)

FULBECK.

217. *Mr. Gregory's Perticuler* [of rents] *of lands in Fulbeck, to bee sold.* 1676. 1 f. (Ryl. Ch. 2585.)

FULSTOW.

218. *A Particular of the Rents wth the number of acres* of Henry Hyldeyard's estate in Fulstow. n.d. [*c.* 1685]. 4 ff. (*ib.* 2586).

GATE BURTON.

219. Two rentals of Gate Burton, being the lands of the Rt. Hon. Francis, Lord Willoughby, Baron of Parham. 1654-1660. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2587).

GEDNEY.

220. *Mr. Adlard Stewkeley's Perticuler of Gedney* [rents]. 1684. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2591).

221. A particular of rents of the manor of Gedney. n.d. [late 17th cent.]. 2 ff., imperf. (*ib.* 2596).

GLANFORD BRIGG.

222. Roll of Courts, with View of Frankpledge, of the feoffees of William Tyrwhit, kt. Oct. 1503-Ap. 1504. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (imperf.) (*ib.* 3137).

GOSBERTON.

223. Two rentals of the manor of *Barrapier* in Gosberton. n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 2 ff., endorsed *Mr. Meller* and *Mr. Millard* respectively (*ib.* 2599).

GREETWELL.

224. A particular of rents of Sir Robert Dallison's estate. n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2612).

HAGNABY.

225. A particular of rents of Robert Newcomen's lands in Hagnaby. n.d. [*c.* 1653]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2613).

HARRINGTON.

226. *Mr.* [Hugh] *Bethell's perticuler* [of rents] *of the mannour of Harrington.* n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2614).

HECKINGTON.

227. A rental and particular of the manor of Heckington. 1654. 1 f. (*ib.* 2615).

HOLBEACH.

228. A particular of the rents of the lands of Thomas, Earl of Sussex in the parish of Holbeach. n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2616).

229. *A perticuler* [of rents] *of the Mannour of Hackbitch neare Holbitch.* n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. Endorsed: *Mr. Claypoole* (*ib.* 2617).

230. A particular of the rents of the manor of Holbeach. 1678. 1 f. (*ib.* 2618).

HOUGH.

231. A particular of rents of Sir William Thorold's estate at Hough. 1675. f. (*ib.* 2620a).

232. The same. n.d. [late 17th cent.]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2620b).

KELSTERN, ETC.

233. Particulars and rentals of Mr. South's lands in Kelstern, Coats and Elkington, 1674-78. 17 ff. (*ib.* 2627).

KETTLEBY.

234. Two particulars of rents respecting estates of (*a*) the late Francis Tirwhitt, esq., 1673; (*b*) Mr. Elwes, 1674. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2628).

KIRTON IN LINDSEY.

235. *The Custom of the Soke of Kirton.* 12 July 1527. Paper roll, 6 'skins'. 18th cent. copy (*ib.* 3149).

236. *An Abstract out of the generall Survey of the Soke of Kirketon in Lindesey . . . with all the Manors, townships* [etc.] *within or belonging unto the same, being parcel of the inheritance of . . . Charles, Prince of Wales . . . as belonging unto his Dukedom of Cornwall.* 1616. 136 ff. Transcript by Edward Peacock of Camb. Univ. Library MS. 1273. (Eng. MS. 216.)

237. *A Rentall of the Lordship of Kirton in Lindsey.* 1650. 60 ff. Transcribed by Edward and Mrs. Peacock [1] (*ib.* 133).

KNAITH.

238. A particular of rents of Knaith Lordship. 11 June 1661. 1 f. (Ryl. Ch. 2629.)

KYME, NORTH.

239. *A Perticuler* [of rents] *of lands* [2] *in Mr. Taylor's security,* 1652. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2630).

240. *A Perticuler* [of rents] *of S^r Charles Dymock's landes in Mortgage to Mr. Clitherow.* 1683. 1 f. (*ib.* 2633).

LUDBOROUGH.

241. A rental of the manor of Ludborough. 1663. 1 f. Endorsed: *Sir Thomas Hanmore.* With two duplicates (*ib.* 2642).

MANLEY.

242. *Extracta Curiarum* [3] *infra Wapentage de Manley . . . A^o* 1630 *et* 1631 [i.e. fines and amercements, Oct. 1630-Sept. 1631]. 6 Dec. 1631. Transcript made by Edward Peacock, *c.* 1860, of "a paper book of nine leaves". (Eng. M.S. 247, ff. 108-122.)

243. The same [4] [Sept. 1661-Sept. 1662]. 1662. Similar transcript of "a paper roll consisting of ten sheets" (*ib.*, ff. 126-41v°).

[1] Very brief extracts made by Edward Peacock from miscellaneous records, including court rolls and valors relating to the manor of Kirton in Lindsey at the Public Record Office, occur in Eng. MS. 426.

[2] North Kyme, South Kyme, Dogdyke.

[3] Asbie, Burringham, Froddingham, Scunthorpe, Brombye, Yaddlethorpe, Waddingham, Winterton, Kirton Sabbati, Butterwick, Bottesford.

[4] Ashby, Burringham, Winterton, Kirton Sabbati, Scunthorpe, Waddingham, Brumby, Froddingham, Redburne, Yadlethorpe.

MUMBY.

244. An extent of Lord Sherard's lands in Mumby, Helsey, Mumbey Chapel and Hogsthorpe. 28 June 1673. 1 f. (Ryl. Ch. 2647).

NOCTON.

245. A particular of rents of the Lordship and Manor of Nocton. 1675. 2 ff. With duplicate (*ib.* 2649).

ORBY.

246. *The Articles of the Court belonging to the mannour of Orby found and agreed upon by the Jury . . . att a Court held* 16 *Aprill* 1655, followed by a rental of freehold rents due to Robert Clayton each Michaelmas. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2658).

247. Suit roll for the manor of Orby. 29 Sept. 1670. Paper, 1 'skin' (*ib.* 2662).

248. Extract from proceedings at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron for the manor of Orby. 27 Ap. 1671 (*ib.* 2663).

249. Rentals of Orby for 15 June 1678, 1 f. (*ib.* 2670); Mich. 1680, 1 f. (*ib.* 2673); 1681, 2ff. (*ib.* 2674-75); 1685-86, 3 ff. (*ib.* 2681); 1690, 1691, 2 ff. (*ib.* 2685); 1706, 1709-11, 1747, 5 ff. (*ib.* 2689).

ORMSBY, NORTH.

250. Particulars of the half-yearly rents of Nun Ormsby. n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 3 ff. (*ib.* 2692).

PANTON.

251. Rental of Panton for half a year, due at Michaelmas 1671. 1 f. (*ib.* 2693).

PICKWORTH.

252. A rental of Pickworth for half a year. 1657. 1 f. (*ib.* 2694).

253. Arrears of rent at Pickworth, due Mayday 1690. 1 f. (*ib.* 2695).

POINTON.

254. *A view of the Mannour of Pointon . . . taken the tenth day of June* 1659 *by Jonas Moore, Surveyor to the . . . Earl of Lincolne, Lord and owner of the said Mannour.* Book of 8 ff. Contemporary copy. (*ib.* 2699).

255. Particular of rents of lands in Poynton parish belonging to the Rt. Hon. Theophilus, Earl of Lincoln. 1659. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2700).

RUSKINGTON.

256. Rolls of the Court Baron for the manor of West Hall in Ruskington cum membris.[1] 1 Nov. 1666 and 13 Oct. 1670. Parchm., 2 rolls (*ib.* 59-60).

SCAMPTON.

257. A particular of the rents of the lordship and manor of Scampton. 1672. 1 f. (*ib.* 2703).

[1] Anwicke, Durrington, Leasingham.

SCOTTER.

258. Compotus rolls of bailiffs, farmers and collectors of the rents. Mich. 1372-Mich. 1373, 7 mm. (*ib.* 3191); Mich. 1385-Mich. 1386, 4 mm. (*ib.* 3192); Mich. 1454-Mich. 1456 (*ib.* 3193, 3 mm.; *ib.* 3194, 3 mm.); Mich. 1460-Mich. 1461, 3 mm. (*ib.* 3195); Mich. 1462-Mich. 1463, 4 mm. (*ib.* 3196); Mich. 1483-Mich. 1484, 3 mm. (*ib.* 3197); n.d. [early 16th cent.], 3 mm. (*ib.* 3198); Mich. 1501-Mich. 1505 (*ib.* 3199, 3 mm; *ib.* 3200, 2 mm.; *ib.* 3201, 3 mm.; *ib.* 3202, 2 mm.); Mich. 1508-Mich. 1511 (*ib.* 3203, 1 m.; *ib.* 3204, 2 mm.; *ib.* 3205, 2 mm.); n.d. [c. 1523], 3 mm. (*ib.* 3206); Mich, 1523-Mich. 1524, 3 mm. (*ib.* 3207); Mich. 1540-Mich. 1544 (*ib.* 3208-10, 2 mm. each). 19 parchm. rolls.

259. Miscellaneous extracts[1] from Court Rolls of the manor of Scotter. Oct. 1519-1757. 150 ff. Copied by Edward Peacock, late 19th cent. (Eng. MS. 240.)

SEMPRINGHAM, ETC.

260. *Lord of Lincolne's perticuler*, 1658 [being rentals of Sempringham, Folkingham, Pointon, Aslackby, Swaton, Threckingham and Billingborough for Ladyday 1654]. Book of 6 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 2798.)

SPALDING, ETC.

261. An extent of lands, etc. in Spalding and elsewhere in co. Lincoln to be granted to George, Marquis of Buckingham, for support of his dignities. 1619.[2] 11ff. (*ib.* 2787).

SUTTON.

262. Rental for Sutton Marsh for Ladyday and Michaelmas. 1688. 1 f. (*ib.* 2714).

TATTERSHALL, ETC.

263. *Lord of Lincolne's Perticuler.*[3] 1657. 6 ff. (*ib.* 2717).

THORNTON.

264. Valor of possessions of the former Abbey of Thornton. n.d. [temp. Hen. VIII]. Copy, made by Edward Peacock in 1860, of a " copy made from the Valor in the Court of Augmentations ". (Eng. MS. 247, ff. 29-31.)

THORPE TILNEY.

265. A rental of the manor of Thorpe Tilney *alias* Timberland Thorpe. 1673. 2 ff. (Ryl. Ch. 2719.)

[1] Other extracts, of Oct. 1562, Oct. 1603 and March 1604, are now Ryl. Ch. 3211-13.

[2] See *Cal. State Papers Domestic* (1619-23), p. 64.

[3] Includes rentals of Tattershall, Tattershall Thorpe, Snowden Grange, Kirkby and Martin.

TIMBERLAND.

266. A rental of Timberland. Mich. 1657. 1 f. (*ib.* 2720).

TUPHOLME.

267. A particular of rents of the manor of Tupholme. 1661. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2726).

UFFINGTON.

268. A particular of rents of lands and tenements in Uffington and Tallington. n.d. [*c.* 1670]. 2 ff. Endorsed: *John Clitherow.* With duplicate. (*ib.* 2749).

WAINFLEET.

269. Two particulars of rents in Wainfleet, concerning Mr. Barkham. n.d. [mid-17th cent.]. 2 ff. (*ib.* 2753).

WILLOUGHBY.

270. A particular of rents of Sir Thomas Ogles' estate.[1] 1673. 1 f. (*ib.* 2755).

WINTERTON.

271. *Rent due to the King for one halfe yeare out of all the Soke lands in Winterton.* " Copy of a single sheet " made by Edward Peacock *c.* 1860, but no date given. (Eng. MS. 247, ff. 124-125).

WOODTHORPE.

272. *A rentroll of certaine demeasne rents due to the Earle of Berkshire in the Countie of Lincolne.*[2] 12 Oct. 1664. Paper, 1 ' skin '. (*ib.* 2801).

WRAGBY.

273. A particular of farm rents at Wragby. 1662. 1 f. (*ib.* 2774).

274. A particular of rents of the manor of Wragby. 1663. 3 ff. (*ib.* 2776).

WYKES.

275. A particular of rents of the manor of Wykes, concerning Sir John May, kt., and dame Mary, his wife, and John Morris and Robert Clayton. *c.* 1672-76. 11 ff. (*ib.* 2782).

[1] Manor of Willoughby, freehold lands in Pinchbacke, manor of Spalding Croyland.

[2] Woodthorpe, Markeby, Ulceby and Forthington, Morebie, Woodenderby, Halton, Hammeringham, Bennington and Butterwicke, Fishtofte, Helpringham, Wilkesby.

LONDON.

276. *A Perticuler* [of rents] *of S^r^ Paul Neile's Houses before the Fire.* 1675. 1 f. (*ib.* 3774).

NORFOLK.

BURNHAM DEEPDALE.

277. *Depdale: Compotus Johannis Heyward, ballivi ibidem.* Mich. 1454-Mich. 1455. Parchm. roll, 3 mm. (Phillipps 20.)

CARLTON, EAST.

278. *East Carleton: Compotus Hugonis, servientis Willelmi de Curszon ibidem.* Mich. 1277-Mich. 1278. Parchm. roll, 3 mm. (*ib.* 17).

279. *Carleton: Compotus Phelipi de Naseburgh', ballivi ibidem Willelmi Appylierd in manerio suo.* Mich. 1406-Mich. 1407. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (imperf.) (*ib.* 18).

FAKENHAM LANCASTER.

280. Extracts from proceedings at the General Court, with Leet, for the manor of Fakenham Lancaster. 9 Oct. 1705 (*Ryl. Ch.* 401); 22 May 1758 (*ib.* 402); 21 May 1759 (*ib.* 403).

GASTHORPE.

281. [*Compotus* (torn)] *servientis ibidem.* Mich. 1417-Mich. 1418. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (Phillipps 19.)

HARLING, WEST.

282. Compotus rolls of Thomas Picot, Mich. 1328-Mich. 1330 (*ib.* 12, 3 mm.; *ib.* 10, 3 mm.); Richard Wowere, Mich. 1332-Mich. 1333, 3 mm. (*ib.* 11); Richard Wowere, Mich. 1335-Mich. 1336, 3 mm. (*ib.* 13); John Miles, Mich. 1357-Mich. 1358, 3 mm. (*ib.* 14); John Baret, Mich. 1369-Mich. 1370, 3 mm. (*ib.* 15); John Baret, Mich. 1372-Mich. 1373, 3 mm. (*ib.* 16); John Baret, Mich. 1377-Mich. 1378, 3 mm. (*ib.* 9). 8 parchm. rolls.

HORSHAM ST. FAITH.

283. A rental of the manor of Horsham St. Faith. 1724-61. Paper book, 40 ff. (Eng. MS. 941.)

INGHAM.

284. Compotus roll of receipts of Sir John Fortescue, kt., for the manor of Ingham. 22 Hen. VII. (Endorsed: *1506*). Paper, 5 'skins'. (Phillipps 21.)

WIGHTON.

285. Extracts from proceedings at the General Court for the manor of Wighton. 16 Ap. 1616 (Ryl. Ch. 2811); 9 Dec. 1623 (*ib.* 2812); 10 Dec. 1644 (*ib.* 2815); 11 Ap. 1654 and 13 Oct. 1657 (*ib.* 2817); 18 Oct. 1659 (*ib.* 2818); 1 Ap. 1662 (*ib.* 2819); 2 May and 14 Oct. 1674 (*ib.* 2821); 7 Nov. 1695 (*ib.* 2822); 27 July 1721 (*ib.* 2823).

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

COTTINGHAM.

286. *Cotyngham : Compotus Roberti Chapman, collectoris ibidem.* Mich. 1523-Mich. 1524. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (imperf.) (*ib.* 3131).

MAXEY.

287. A rental of the manor of Maxey. n.d. [mid-17th cent]. 1 f. (*ib.* 2644).

PETERBOROUGH.

288. Roll of Courts, with View of Frankpledge, of the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough, held[1] 10 Oct., 11 Oct., and 18 Oct. *anno supradicto.* Endorsed: *Ed.*: 6 : 2° Mich. [1548]. Parchm. roll, 1 m. (*ib.* 3188).

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

EPPERSTONE.

289. *Epperston : Compotus Willelmi Phillipot, ballivi ibidem.* 14 Hen. IV. [1412/13].-2 Hen. V [1414/15]. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (imperf.). (Ryl. Ch. 64.)

OSBERTON.

290. *Compotus Johannis filii Ricardi de manerio de Osbarton.* Mich. 1397-Mich. 1398. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (Tatton 1183.)

SHROPSHIRE.

OSWESTRY.

291. *Oswestry : Ancient Rent Rolls*; being rentals and surveys relating to the manor, town and lordship of Oswestry, *temp.* Eliz.-*temp.* Jas. I. Early 17th cent. Paper book, 286 ff. (Lat. MS. 274.)[2]

WEM.

292. *The hole Customes of the lordship of Wem* ; on the dorso is part of a Survey of the County relating to the Hundreds of North and South Bradford. n.d. [16th cent.]. Parchm. roll, 3 mm. (Phillipps 3.)

WHITCHURCH.

293. Extracts from proceedings at the Court Baron for the manor of Whitchurch. 13 Feb. 1695, 12 Oct. 1750, 31 May 1751. (Tatton 1409-11.)

STAFFORDSHIRE.

ELLASTONE.

294. Court Roll of the manor of Ellastone. 10 Dec. 1548. Paper, 1 'skin' (Crutchley 91a).

[1] At North Colingham, Grantham and Longthorpe, respectively.

[2] Formerly in the possession of Scipio Le Squyer (1579-1659), Deputy Chamberlain of the Exchequer (1620-59).

TUNSTALL.

295. Extract from proceedings [1] at the Small Court held there 2 Ap. 1517. (Jodrell 302.)

WHITTINGTON.

296. Staffordshire rental (beg. imperf.) relating, at least in part, to Whittington (1508). n.d. [late Hen. VII]. Parchm. roll, 4 mm. (imperf.). (Phillipps 126.)

SUFFOLK.

IPSWICH.

297. *Rentale reddittuum* [2] *canonicorum priorissatus beatorum appostolorum Petri et Pauli Gippeswici a festo Sancti Michaelis Archangeli anno domini quingentesimo sexto decimo.* Parchm. roll, 3 mm. Copy, made 1591. (Crutchley 174.)

298. Rental of the above suppressed house.[3] n.d. [temp. Hen. VIII]. Parchm., 1 m. Copy, made July 1609 (*ib.* 175).

299. Court rolls of the manor of Goddlesford, Sept. 1600 and May 1606, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 726); March 1693, Oct. 1700, Feb. and July 1710, Oct. and Dec. 1711, Feb. and Sept. 1712, Jan. 1715, Ap. 1717, parchm., 5 mm. (*ib.* 853); 2 Dec. 1717, parchm., 1 m. (*ib.* 854).

IXWORTH.

300. Extracts from proceedings at Courts (View of Frankpledge with General Court, Special Courts) of the manor of Ixworth, 28 Ap. 1618 (Ryl. Ch. 3335), 12 Oct. 1631 (*ib.* 3336), 7 Oct. 1634 (*ib.* 3339), 6 Oct. 1640 (*ib.* 3340), 8 Oct. 1642 (*ib.* 3341), 28 Jan. 1648 (*ib.* 3343).

MENDLESHAM.

301. *Copy of proceedings in Court on a trial by a Jury before the Steward to determine the right of persons to copyholds of the manor.* Sept. 1573. Parchm. roll, 2 mm. (*ib.* 167).

302. Extracts from proceedings at Courts Baron with View of Frankpledge for the manor of Mendlesham. May 1489, Ap. 1494, Ap. 1516, 1518, Jan. 1530, Jan. 1561, Oct. 1563, 1572, Oct. 1577, Jan. 1579, Oct. 1582 (*ib.* 168); Oct. 1667, Ap. 1696 (*ib.* 169).

[1] Concerning lands in Tunstall and Burslem.

[2] Ipswich (parishes of SS. Peter, Nicholas, Mary Elms, Matthew, Mary Tower, Lawrence, Stephen, Helen and Margaret), Werstede, Belstede, Freston, Arowton, Bokylsham, Nacton, Chatsham, Hyntelsham, Capell, Holton, Raydon, manor of Walton, Wyttylsham, Mendylsham, Wasbroke, Henley, Kesgrave, Burstall, Bramford, Hemmyngston, Westerfeld, Kenbroke, Tremley, Layham, Sprowton, Gretingham, Thorleston, Somersham.

[3] Manors of Panington, Borenehall, and Cretingham, lands, etc. in Whersted, Brameford, Thurlestone, Hemyngston', Codenham and Goosebak.

MIDDLETON.

303. Court Book of the manor of Austin's in Middleton. Ap. 1694-Oct. 1754. Parchm., 49 ff. (Lat. MS. 369.)

WHERSTEAD.

304. Rental of freehold and copyhold in Wherstead belonging to Bourn Hall. Paper roll, 2 ' skins '. n.d. [early 16th cent.]. With copy. (Crutchley 770.)

305. Extract from proceedings [1] at a Court of the manor of Thorington Hall in Wherstead. 14 Dec. 1531 (*ib.* 774).

306. Survey of the manor of Bourn Hall in Wherstead. 22 Nov. 1563 (*ib.* 779, ff. 1-43).

307. Rental of the manor of Bourn Hall. Mich. 1564-Mich. 1565 (*ib.*, ff. 51-54).

308. Survey of *The Spiritualltyes dewe to the Colledge* from the manor of Bourn Hall. n.d. [16th cent]. (*ib.* 780, ff. 1-6v.).

309. Valor of the manor of Bourn Hall. 17 June 1606. 1 f. (*ib.* 811).

310. Court Book of the manors of Bourn Hall in Wherstead (ff. 1-7) and Wherstead (ff. 13-18). Oct. 1627-June 1640. Paper book, 25 ff. (ff. 19-25 blank). (*ib.* 835).

311. Court rolls of the manor of Bourn Hall [2] in Wherstead. Oct. 1276-Oct. 1305, parchm., 11 mm. (*ib.* 749); Dec. 1311-July 1325, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 752); May 1340-47 Edw. III, parchm., 13 mm. (*ib.* 760); Dec. 1389-Oct. 1400, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 761); Nov. 1402-Oct. 1404, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 762); Nov. 1436-Nov. 1458, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 764); Jan. 1472-Jan. 1489, parchm., 5 mm. (*ib.* 766); 1470-1506, paper, 22 ' skins ' (*ib.* 767); Ap. 1491-Dec. 1507, parchm., 10 mm. (*ib.* 768); 1529-1544, paper, 10 ' skins ' (imperf.) (*ib.* 769); Oct. 1567-Sept. 1590, paper, 15 ' skins ' (*ib.* 792); Ap. 1613-June 1620, parchm., 6 mm. (*ib.* 829); May 1597-Sept. 1663, parchm., 19 mm. (*ib.* 838); July 1693-Feb. 1717, parchm., 10 mm. (*ib.* 853).

312. Court rolls of the manor of Wherstead. June 1616-Dec. 1661, parchm., 7 mm. (*ib.* 837); June 1701, Dec. 1702, Dec. 1710, Sept. and Nov. 1714, parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 853).

SURREY.

ALBURY.

313. A particular of rents of the manor of Albury. 1681. Paper, 1 f. (Ryl. Ch. 3632.)

BERMONDSEY.

314. Court roll of the manor of Bermondsey. Oct. 1638, Oct. 1639. Parchm., 2 mm. (*ib.* 165).

[1] Concerning lands in Wherstead.

[2] Extracts from proceedings at Courts for this manor occur in Crutchley 775 (23, 25 and 27 Hen. VIII) and 816-17 (June 1607).

315. Estreats of fines and amercements at Courts Leet and Courts Baron of the same. Oct. 1692-Oct. 1695. Parchm. roll, 9 mm. (*ib.* 166).

HORSLEY, WEST.

316. Court rolls of the manor of West Horsley. Feb. 1385-Aug. 1389, Ap. 1415-Feb. 1416, May 1421-Ap. 1422, Nov. 1423, Dec. 1435-Feb. 1446, Ap. 1484, Oct. 1485-Ap. 1486, Ap. 1489-Feb. 1498, parchm., 26 mm. (Nicholas 1); June 1473-Oct. 1485, paper, 7 'skins' (*ib.* 2); Nov. 1556-Ap. 1558, Ap. 1559-March 1601, parchm. 29 mm. (*ib.* 3); Ap. 1605-Ap. 1624, parchm., 20 mm. (*ib.* 4); Ap. 1625-Ap. 1650, parchm., 39 mm. (*ib.* 5); March 1654-March 1655, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 7); Oct. 1656-Oct. 1668, parchm., 16 mm. (*ib.* 8; also in *ib.* 6, a paper book of 42 ff.); Dec. 1669-Oct. 1672, parchm., 11 mm. (*ib* 9)[1]; Oct. 1673-Ap. 1680, parchm., 12 mm. (*ib.* 10); Oct. 1681-Oct. 1688, parchm., 12 mm. (*ib.* 11); May 1690-Oct. 1701, parchm., 19 mm. (*ib.* 12); Oct. 1702-Oct. 1709,[2] parchm., 12 mm. (*ib.* 13).

317. Jury presentments for the same. 1714, 1719. 1 f. (*ib.* 61, No. 7).

318. Extract from proceedings at a Court of the same, held 5 Nov. 1720. (*ib.* 82, no. 2).

319. A register of the freehold and copyhold of the manor of West Horsley, 16th-18th cent. n.d. [18th cent.]. 120 ff. (*ib.* 24).

SUSSEX.

CUCKFIELD.

320. Extract from proceedings at a Court of the manor of Cuckfield. 27 Oct. 1725. (Ryl. Ch. 3634.)

FRAMFIELD.

321. *Framfeild: Liber Curiarum ibidem* [Courts of Margaret, Countess Dowager of Thanet, Lady of the Manor]. Sept. 1665-March 1675. Paper book, 110 ff. (Lat. MS. 382.)

WARWICKSHIRE.

HEMLINGFORD HUNDRED.

322. Jury presentments at the View of Frankpledge with Court Baron for the Hundred of Hemlingford. 15 Ap. 1721. 1 f. (Ryl. Ch. 2054.)

[1] An estreat of fines and amercements at the Court Leet and Court Baron held 10 Oct. 1671 occurs in Nicholas 61, no. 4 (2 ff.).

[2] A list of jury presentments at the Court Baron held 10 Oct. 1707 occurs in Nicholas 61, no. 6 (1 f.).

WILTSHIRE.

GENERAL.

323. Court rolls for various manors [1] belonging to Sir John Thynne of Longleat, co. Wilts, Sept. 1568-Oct. 1569. Parchm., 12 rolls (*ib.* 62).

URCHFONT.

324. Compotus rolls of bailiffs of St. Mary's Abbey, Winchester. Mich. 1448-Mich. 1449, parchm., 3 mm. (*ib.* 170); Mich. 1522-Mich. 1526, parchm., 3 rolls of 2 mm. each (*ib.* 171-73).

YORKSHIRE.

GENERAL (N.R.).

325. *Rotulus curialis Johannis Le Scrope in partibus borialibus.*[2] 15 Oct.-30 Oct. 1537. Parchm. roll, 6 mm. (*ib.* 63).

HALIFAX (W.R.).

326. Extract from proceedings at a Court of William Ingram and Richard Golthorpp, gentlemen. 11 Oct. 1613. (Clowes 436.)

HOLMFIRTH (W.R.).

327. Extracts from proceedings at the Holmfirth Great Court Baron. 28 May 1794 and 31 Oct. 1821. (Ryl. Ch. 2318-19.)

HOWSHAM (E.R.).

328. Court rolls of the manor of Howsham Hall. 7 Feb. 1743 and 10 Nov. 1746. Parchm., 2 rolls. (*ib.* 61).

METHLEY (W.R.).

329. *A briefe colleccion of divers orders, penalties, customes and usages within the mannor of Meathley, gathered out of the Court Rolls* [1331-1587]. n.d. [late 16th cent.]. (Lat. MS. 249, ff. 21-64v.)

330. *The perticuler Surveye of all the groundes in Meathleye.* n.d. [late 16th cent.] (*ib.*, ff. 3-13v.).

[1] Corslye, Deverell Langbridge, Mounton Deverell, Kyngston Deverell, Sutton Parva, Bagendon, Bucklande and Laverton, Kemisforde, Easthorringdon, Frome and Westwodlandes, Lullyngton, Walton, Wemisforde, Winford, Whitteborne.

[2] Barnyngham, Est Bolton, West Bolton, Briginall, Carparby, Caldwell, Disforth, Downholme, Fencotte, Harneby, Laborne, Fletham, Midelton, Newsham, Preston, Rydmer, Sutton Holgrave, Thornbarghe, Thornton Rust, Thornton Stewarde, Uckerby, Wenslay, Wynston, Nerther Ellington, Ellerton, Bolton and Whitwell.

331. *Rentale omnium redditorum de Methley in onere et collectione ballivi ac prepositi eiusdem manerii debitorum in festis Sancti Martini, Purificacionis, Annunciacionis, Pentecostis ac Michaelis Anno Regis Jacobi primo* [1603]. (*ib.*, ff. 72v.-74).

332. *The ancient rentes of Metheley, 4^to^ April :* 1609. (*ib.* f. 88v.).

NORTHALLERTON (N.R.).

333. Extracts from proceedings at the Halmote and Chief Court Baron for the manor of Northallerton. 7 Oct. 1727 (Ryl. Ch. 3358.); 7 Oct. 1738 (*ib.* 3360) ; 2 Oct. 1762 (*ib.* 3378).

WAKEFIELD (W.R.).

334. Extract from proceedings at the Wakefield Court Baron. 9 Sept. 1825. (*ib.* 2463).

WHITWOOD (W.R.).

335. *Rentale manerii de Whitwood.* 13 Dec. 1603. (Lat. MS. 249, f. 71v^o^.)

INDEX OF PERSONS AND PLACES.

Abbatt, Mr., 213.
Abbotsley, Hunts., 129.
Aby, Linc., 195.
Accrington, Lanc., 146 and notes.
Acton, Edward, chaplain, 62.
Adgarley, *see* Bolton with Adgarley.
Adlington, Lanc., 140, 141n.
Albury, Surr., 313.
Alchorne, Mr., 207.
Alcock, Roger, Mayor of Macclesfield, Chesh., 38.
Alderley, Nether, Chesh., 7n. ; Over, Chesh., 7n.
Aldon (Alden), Salop, 4n.
Alford, Linc., 188.
Althurst, in Norbury, Chesh., 67.
Alvaston, Chesh., 67.
Amcotts, Linc., 189.
Amcotts, E. W. C., 189, 204, 216.
Anderton, Chesh., 7n.
Anwick (Anwicke), Linc., 256n.
Appleby, Christopher, 42.
Appylierd, William, 279.
Arowton, *see* Erwarton.
Ashby (Asbie, Askeby), Linc., 185n., 190, 242n., 243n.
Ashton (Assheton), Chesh., 4n., 76.
Ashton in Makerfield (Ashton), Lanc., 135n.
Ashworth (Assheworthe), Lanc., 142, 148, 149n.
Askeby, *see* Ashby.
Aslackby, Linc., 260.
Aslackoe (Aslokhowe), Linc., 185n.
Aspull, Lanc., 139-141.
Assheton, *see* Ashton, Chesh.
Assheton, Mary, 176 ; William, 176.
Assheworthe, *see* Ashworth.
Astbury, Chesh., 43n.
Astle, Chesh., 23n.
Aston, Chesh., 8-9, 67.
Atkyns, Ed., 192.
Austin's, Suff., manor of, *see under* Middleton.
Aykbank (Ayke Bank), Lanc., 135n.
Aylesby (Aylisby), Linc., 186n.

Baddiley (Badeley, Badyley), Chesh., 10, 63, 67.
Bagendon, Glouc., 323n.
Baguley, Chesh., 67.
Balderstone (Botherstone), in Rochdale par., Lanc., 142, 167.
Balshawe, *see* Bolshaw.
Barbour, William, 175.
Bardney, Linc., 191-192.
Baret, John, 282.
Barkham, Mr., 269.
Barking, Essex, 122.
Barlborough (Barleburgh), Derb., 89, 105n.
Barley, John de, 90.
Barningham (Barnyngham), Yorks., 325n.
Barnshaw, *see* Goostrey-cum-Barnshaw.
Barnton, Chesh., 7n.
Barrapier (in Gosberton), Linc., manor of, 223.
Barrow (Barrowe), Linc., 186n., 193.
Barrowby, Linc., 194.
Barthomley, Chesh., 76.
Barton, Lanc., 143.
Barton-on-Humber (Barton super Humbr'), Linc., 186n.

Bebington, Chesh., 27n.
Bekerton, *see* Bickerton.
Belleau, Linc., 195.
Belstead (Belstede), Suff., 297n.
Benington (Bennington), Linc., 272n.
Berkshire, 1-2.
Berkshire, Earl of, 210, 272.
Bermondsey, Surr., 314-315.
Betchton (Birchton), Chesh., 43n.
Bethell, Hugh, 226.
Bexton, Chesh., 67.
Bickerton (Bekerton), Chesh., 67.
Billingborough, Linc., 260.
Billinge, Lanc., 135n.
Birchton, *see* Betchton.
Biscathorpe (Biskerthorpe), Linc., 196.
Bispham, Lanc., 159n.
Bitchfield (Bitchfeild), Linc., 197.
Blackburn, Lanc., Wapentake of, 146.
Blackley (Bleakley), Lanc., 135n.
Blackrod (Blakerode), Lanc., 140, 141n., 173n.
Blackstone Edge, Lanc., 180n.
Blackwell (Blakwell) nr. Alfreton, Derb., 105n.
Blacon, Chesh., 4n., 76.
Blakerode, *see* Blackrod.
Blakwell, *see* Blackwell.
Bleakley, *see* Blackley.
Bokylsham, *see* Bucklesham.
Bold, Lanc., 135n.
Bolingbroke (Bullingbroke), Linc., 198.
Bollin Fee, Chesh., 11-12.
Bollington, Chesh., 36n.
Bolshaw (Balshawe), Northenden, Chesh., 14n.
Bolton, *see* Bolton-upon-Swale.
Bolton, Est, *see* Castle Bolton.
Bolton, West (Aysgarth), Yorks., 325n.
Bolton-upon-Swale (Bolton), Yorks., 325n.
Bolton with Adgarley (Urswick par.), Lanc., 144.
Borenehall, *see* Bourn Hall.
Boterwyk, *see* Butterwick, Hundred of.
Botherstone, *see* Balderstone.
Bottesford, Linc., 199, 242n.
Boughton, Linc., 200.
Bourne (Burn), Linc., 186n.
Bourn Hall (Borenehall), Suff., manor of, *see under* Wherstead.
Boxted, *see* Rivers Hall.
Boythorpe (Boythorp'), Derb., 105n.
Bradford, North, Salop, Hundred of, 292; South, Salop, Hundred of, 292.
Bramford (Brameford), Suff., 297n., 298n.
Branston, Linc., 201.
Brawby, John, 193.
Bretherton, Lanc., 173n.
Brignall (Briginall), Yorks., 325n.
Brindley, Chesh., 10n.
Brocklesby (Brokelesby), Linc., 186n.
Brokys Bonke [Lanc.], 173n.
Bromborough (Bromboroughe, Brumbrugh'), Chesh., 27n., 30.
Bromby(e), *see* Brumby.
Bromfield (Bromefelde), Salop, 4n.
Bromley, William de, 3.
Broughton (Manchester par.), Lanc., 136n.
Brownley Green (Brounley Greene), Northenden, Chesh., 14n.
Broxton, Chesh., 7n.
Brumbrugh,' *see* Bromborough.
Brumby (Bromby(e)), Linc., 185n., 242n., 243n.
Brunker, Mr., 116.
Bubdon, *see* Bupton.
Buckingham, George, Marquis of, 261.
Buckland (Bucklande), Glouc., 323n.
Bucklesham (Bokylsham), Suff., 297n.
Bucknall, Linc., 202.
Buerton (Bwerton), Chesh., 27n.
Buglawton (Bugulaton), Chesh., 43n., 67.
Bullingbroke, *see* Bolingbroke.
Bupton (Bubdon), Derb., 93n.
Burland, Chesh., 10n.
Burn, *see* Bourne.
Burnaston, Derb., 104.
Burnham Deepdale (Depdale), Norf., 277.
Burringham (Buryngham), Linc., 185n., 242n., 243n.
Burslem, Staff., 295n.
Burstall, Suff., 297n.
Burton, Linc., 185n.
Burtonwood, Lanc., 135n.
Buryngham, *see* Burringham.
Butterwick, (Butterwicke), Linc., 242n., 272n.
,, East (Est Butterwyk), Linc., 185n.
,, (Boterwyk), Linc., Hundred of, 203.
Butterworth, Lanc., 156.
Bwerton, *see* Buerton.

Cabourn (Caborne), Linc., 186n.
Caldey, *see* Caldy.
Caldwell, Yorks., 325n.
Caldy (Caldey), Chesh., 75.
Capel (Capell), Suff., 297n.
Capenhurst, Chesh., 67.
Carleton, *see* Carlton, East.
Carleton, Lanc., 145, 159n.
Carlton, East (East Carleton, Carleton), Norf., 278-279.
Carlton le Moorland (Carlton iuxta Bassingham), Linc., 186n.
Carlton, Little, Linc., 204.
Carperby (Carparby), Yorks., 325n.
Castle Bolton (Est Bolton), Yorks., 325n.
Castleton, Lanc., 136.
Cawkwell, Linc., 205.
Cestr', Les Yates de, *see* Chester.
Chapman, Robert, 286.
Chatburn, Lanc., 146 and notes.
Chattisham (Chatsham), Suff., 297n.

Cheetham (Chetham), Lanc., 136n.
Chelford, Chesh., 20n., 23n.
Cheshire, 3-88, 131.
Chester, Chesh., 7; Eastgate in, 76; (Cestr'), Les Yates de, 4n.
Chetham, *see* Cheetham.
Chetham, Edward, 136, 142, 164; John, 149, 162, 167.
Childer Thornton (Childerthornton), Chesh., 27n.
Chorley, Chesh., 7n., 67.
Chorley, Lanc., 159n., 173n.
Clarke, William, 190.
Claypoole, Mr., 229.
Claythorpe, Linc., 206.
Clayton, Robert, 198, 246, 275.
Cleveger, *see* Cliviger.
Clitheroe, Lanc., Honor of, 146.
Clitherow, Mr., 240; John, 268.
Cliviger (Cleveger), Lanc., 134n.
Clowes, Samuel, 165-66.
Coats, *see* Cotes.
Cockersand (Cokirsande) Abbey, Lanc., 147.
Cockson, Henry, 50.
Coddenham (Codenham), Suff., 298n.
Coke, family, 100.
Cokirsande, *see* Cockersand.
Collingham, North (North Colingham), Nott., 288n.
Colne, Lanc., 146 and notes.
Colsterworth, Linc., 207-208.
Compton, Mr., 196.
Congleton, Chesh., 43n.
Coppull, Lanc., 159n.
Cornwall, Dukedom of, 236.
Corringham (Coryngham), Linc., 185n.
Corsley (Corslye), Wilts., 323n.
Coryngham, *see* Corringham.
Cotes (Coats), Linc., 233.
Cottingham (Cotyngham), Ntht., 286.
Cranage, Chesh., 20n.
Cranwell, Linc., 209.
Cretingham (Gretingham), Suff., 297n., 298n.
Crew, John, 42.
Crewe, Chesh., 76.
Cripplegate, in Rochdale par., Lanc., 142.
Croft, Lanc., 140, 141n.
Crompton, Lanc., 148, 149n.
Crosby (Crosbye), Linc., 186n.
Crossacres, (Cross Acres, Crosse akers), Wythenshawe, Chesh., 14n., 49n.
Croxton, Linc., 186n.
Crumpsall, Lanc., 136n, 164, 179.
Cuckfield, Suss., 320.
Curszon, William de, 278.

Dallison, Sir Robert, 224.
Dalton (Burton in Kendal), Lanc., 135n.
Dalton in Furness, Lanc., 151. *See also* Plain Furness.
Davenport, Chesh., 88.
Dean Row, in Wilmslow par., Chesh., 74.
Deeping Fen, Linc., 210.
Depdale, *see* Burnham Deepdale.
Derbyshire, 89-105.
Deverell Langbridge, *see* Longbridge Deverill.
Devon, 106.
Dinckley (Dynkley), Lanc., 173n.
Dishforth (Disforth), Yorks., 325n.
Disley *or* Disley Stanley (Disley Stanlie), Chesh., 13, 41n., 86n., 137n.
Dogdyke, Linc., 239n.
Donington, Linc., 211-212.
Dorrington (Durrington), Linc., 256n.
Dorset, 107-121.
Downholme, Yorks., 325n.
Droylsden, Lanc., 136n., 164.
Duckmanton (Dukmanton'), Derb., 89n., 105n.
Dunston, Linc., 213.
Durrington, *see* Dorrington.
Duxbury, Lanc., 159n.
Dymock, Sir Charles, 240.
Dynkley, *see* Dinckley.

Eastham (Estham), Chesh., 27n., 30.
Easthorringdon, *see* Horrington, East.
Eaton (Eyton, Yayton), near Congleton, Chesh., 65n., 67.
Eccleston, Lanc., 135n.
Eddisley, *see* Edgeley.
Edge (Egge), Chesh., 67.
Edgeley (Eddisley), Chesh., 67.
Egerton, William, 154.
Egge, *see* Edge.
Elkington, Linc., 233.
Ellastone, Staff., 294.
Ellerton-on-Swale (Ellerton), Yorks., 325n.
Ellington, Nether (Nerther Ellington), Yorks., 325n.
Elliston', *see* Elston.
Elmsthorpe (Elmesthorp), Leic., 4n.
Elsham, Linc., 186n.
Elston (Elliston), Lanc., 173n.
Elswick, Lanc., 140, 141n.
Elwes, Mr., 234.
Epperstone (Epperston), Nott., 289.
Epworth, Linc., 214.
Erwarton (Arowton), Suff., 297n.
Essex, 122-124.
Estham, *see* Eastham.
Etchells (Etchels, Ettchells), Chesh., 14-18, 49-50, 54, 56, 59.
Etwall, Derb., 104.
Eyton, *see* Eaton.

Faddiley (Faddeley), Chesh., 10n.
Failsworth, Lanc., 136n., 164.
Fakenham Lancaster, Norf., 280.
Faringdon, Great, *see* Wadley.

Fearnhead, *see* Poulton with Fearnhead.
Fencote, Great (Fencotte), Yorks., 325n.
Fishtoft (Fishtofte), Linc., 215, 272n.
Flash House (Flossehouses, Frowsshe howsys), in Rochdale par., Lanc., 148, 149n.
Fletham, *see* Kirkby Fleetham.
Flintshire, 5.
Flossehouses, *see* Flash House.
Foliambe, John, 105.
Folkingham, Linc., 260.
Fordington (Forthington), Linc., 272n.
Fortescue, Sir John, 284.
Forthington, *see* Fordington.
Framfield (Framfeild), Suss., 321.
Freston, Suff., 297 n.
Friskney, Linc., 216.
Frocester, Glouc., 126.
Frodingham (Froddingham), Linc., 242n., 243n.
Frome, Som., 323n.
Frowsshe howsys, *see* Flash House.
Fulbeck, Linc., 217.
Fulstow, Linc., 218
Furness, *see* Muchland.

Gasthorpe, Norf., 281.
Gate Burton, Linc., 219.
Gatley, Chesh., 14n.
Gedney, Linc., 220-21.
Gillingham, Dors., Forest, 107-108; Hundred, 107; manor, 107-120 *passim*; Park, 108.
Glanford Brigg, Linc., 222.
Gloucestershire, 125-126.
Goddlesford (Godlesford), Suff., manor of, 100n., 299.
Golborne, Lanc., 135n., 137n., 138n.
Golborne Bellow (Golborn Bellow), Chesh., 7n.
Golthorpp, Richard, 326.
Goosebak, *see* Gosbeck.
Goostrey-cum-Barnshaw, Chesh., 19-23, 88.
Gosbeck (Goosebak), Suff., 298n.
Gosberton, Linc., 223.
Goxhill, Linc., 186n.
Grantham, Linc., 288n.
Grappenhall, Chesh., 137n.
Grasby (Gresby), Linc., 186n.
Greasby (Grevesby), Chesh., 30.
Greetwell, Linc., 224.
Gregory, Mr., 217.
Gresby, *see* Grasby.
Gretingham, *see* Cretingham.
Grevesby, *see* Greasby.
Guilden Sutton, Chesh., 7n.

Habrough, Linc., 186n.
Hackbitch, *see* Hagbeach.
Hacusley [(? Hawkesley), Chesh.], 67.
Haddon, Derb., 90.
Hagbeach (Hackbitch), near Holbeach, Linc., manor of, 229.
Haghton', *see* Haighton.
Hagnaby, Linc., 225.
Haighton (Haghton'), Lanc., 173n.
Halifax, Yorks., 326.
Halton, Chesh., 24-25.
Halton, Linc., 186n., 272n.
Hambleton, Lanc., 153.
Hameringham (Hammeringham), Linc., 272n.
Handley (Hanley), Chesh., 137n.
Hanmore, Sir Thomas, 241.
Hapsford, Chesh., 73.
Hapton, Lanc., 134n.
Hardhorn-with-Newton (Hardhorn cum Newton), Lanc., 159n.
Harling, West, Norf., 282.
Harmby (Harneby), Yorks., 325n.
Harpur, Richard, 26.
Harrington, Linc., 226.
Harrington (Harryngton), Lady Isabel, 173; Sir James, 173-174; Sir William, 175.
Hassall, Chesh., 43n.
Hathersage (Hathersegge, Hathirsegge), Derb., 91-92, 105n.
Haydock, Lanc., 135n.
Heath Houses, Etchells, Chesh., 14n.
Heaton, Lanc., 154.
Heckington, Linc., 227.
Helpringham, Linc., 272n.
Helsey, Linc., 244.
Hemingstone (Hem(m)yngston'), Suff., 297n., 298n.
Hemlingford, Warw., Hundred of, 322.
Hemmyngston, *see* Hemingstone.
Henbury (Hendbury), Chesh., 26.
Hendeley, *see* Hindley.
Henley, Suff., 297n.
Herefordshire, 127-128.
Heswall, Chesh., 75.
Heyward, John, 277.
Hildyard (Hyldeyard), Elizabeth (Welbye), Lady, 187; Henry, 218.
Hindley (Hendeley), Lanc., 135n., 173n.
Hintlesham (Hyntelsham), Suff., 297n.
Hogsthorpe, Linc., 244.
Holbeach (Holbitch), Linc., 228-230.
Holland, Richard, 177.
Hollington (Holyngton), Derb., 93n.
Hollinworth, Mr., 44.
Holmfirth, Yorks., 327.
Holton, Suff., 297n.
Holyngton', *see* Hollington.
Hoole, Lanc., 135n., 138n.
Hooton, Chesh., 27-29.
Horrington, East (Easthorringdon), Som., 323n.
Horsham St. Faith, Norf., 283.
Horsley, West, Surr., 316-319.
Host, James, 192.
Hough, Linc., 231-232.
Houghton, Lanc., 155.

Howsham, Yorks., 328.
Hoylake (Hyle Lake), Chesh., 7n.
Hugh, *serviens* of William de Curszon, 278.
Hulse, Chesh., 19, 20n., 23n.
Hundersfield, Lanc., 156, 180n.
Huntingdonshire, 129-131.
Hurdsfield, Chesh., 41n.
Hurstwood, Lanc., 134n.
Hyldeyard, *see* Hildyard.
Hyle Lake, *see* Hoylake.
Hyntelsham, *see* Hintlesham.

Ightenhill, Lanc., manor of, 146 and notes.
Ingham, Norf., 284.
Ingram, William, 326.
Ipswich, Suff., 297-299; St. Helen, par. of, 297n.; St. Lawrence, par. of, 297n.; St. Margaret, par. of, 297n.; St. Mary Elms, par. of, 297n.; St. Mary Tower, par. of, 297n.; St. Matthew, par. of, 297n.; St. Nicholas, par. of, 297n.; St. Peter, par. of, 297n.; St. Peter and St. Paul, Priory of, 297-298; St. Stephen, par. of, 297n.
Irby (Irreby), Chesh., 30.
Ixworth, Suff., 300.

Jodrell, James, 39n.; family, 6.
Johnson, William, 208.

Keckwick, Chesh., 31.
Kelstern (Kelstron), Linc., 186n., 233.
Kembroke (Kenbroke), Suff., 297n.
Kempsford (Kemisforde), Glouc., 323n.
Kenbroke, *see* Kembroke.
Kenerday, Kenorday, *see* Kenworthy.
Kennyon, William, 177.
Kenworthy (Kenerday, Kenorday, Kenworthey, Kenworthie), Chesh., 14n., 48n., 49n., 50n., 51-53.
Kersal (Kersall), Lanc., 136n., 164.
Kesgrave, Suff., 297n.
Kettleby, Linc., 234.
Kettleshulme, Chesh., 41n.
Killamarsh (Kynwalmersh(e)), Derb., 89n., 105n.
Killingholme (Killingham), Linc., 186n.
Kingston Deverill (Kyngston Deverell), Wilts., 323n.
Kirkby, Linc., 263n.
Kirkby Fleetham (Fletham), Yorks., 325n.
Kirkby Ireleth, Lanc., 157.
Kirkemanshulme, *see* Kirkmanshulme.
Kirketon in Lindsey, *see* Kirton in Lindsey.
Kirketon Sabbati, *see* Kirton Sabbati.
Kirketon Veneris, *see* Kirton Veneris.
Kirkmanshulme (Kirkemanshulme), in Manchester par., Lanc., 163n.
Kirton (Kirketon) in Lindsey, Linc., Manor and Soke of, 235-237.
Kirton Sabbati (Kirketon Sabbati), Linc., 185n., 242n., 243n.
Kirton Veneris (Kirketon Veneris), Linc., 185n.
Knaith, Linc., 238.
Knoktirum' *see* Noctorum.
Knutsford (Knottesford), Chesh., 32-36, 64.
„ Lower (Lawer Knotisford, Nether Knuttesforde), 34, 36n., 67.
„ Over (Knottesford Bothes, Over Knotysford, Over Knuttesforde), 32, 34-36, 67; Norbury Booths (Norbury Bothes), 33.
Kyme, North, Linc., 239-240; South, Linc., 239n.
Kyngston Deverell, *see* Kingston Deverill.
Kynwalmersh(e), *see* Killamarsh.

Laborne, *see* Leyburn.
Laceby, Linc., 186n.
Lancashire, 132-184.
Lancaster, Lanc., 159n.
Langford, Langforth', *see* Longford.
Langley (Middleton par.), Lanc., 158.
Langton, nr. Long Blandford, Dors., 121.
Larton, Chesh., 67.
Lauton Moore, *see* Lawton Moor.
Laverton, Glouc., 323n.
Lawton, *see* Lowton.
Lawton Moor (Lauton Moore), Northenden, Chesh., 53.
Layham, Suff., 297n.
Layton (Bispham par.), Lanc., 159.
Leasingham, Linc., 256n.
Leese (Lees), Chesh., 20n., 23n.
Legh, Anne, 137-138; John, s. James, 32; (Leighe), John, s. Sir John, 33; Peter, 35; family, 135.
Leicestershire, 4.
Leighe, John, *see* Legh.
Leyburn (Laborne), Yorks., 325n.
Leyland, Lanc., 160-161.
Lightfoot, William, 190.
Limber, Great (Magna Lymbergh), Linc., 186n.
Lincoln, Linc., 186n.
Lincoln, Dean and Chapter of, 130.
Lincoln (Lincolne), Theophilus, Earl of, 254-255, 260, 263.
Lincolnshire, 185-275.
Lindsey (Lyndsay), Lord, 188.
Linedred (Line Rood), Lanc., 134n.
Littleworth (Great Faringdon), Berks., 1.
London, 276.
Longbridge Deverill (Deverell Langbridge), Wilts., 323n.
Longford (Langford, Langforth'), Derb., 93-100.
Longford (Langforth, Longforth'), Henry, 95; Nicholas, kt., 89, 91, 93, 101.
Longhurste, the (Disley), Chesh., 13.
Longleat, Wilts., 309.

Longthorpe, Ntht., 288n.
Lostock Gralam (Lostok), Chesh., 37, 67.
Lowton (Lawton), Lanc., 135n., 138n.
Lucas, William, 147.
Ludborough, Linc., 241.
Lullington (Lullyngton), Som., 323n.
Lush, John, 119.
Lyme Handley (Lyme), Chesh., 137n.
Lyndsay, *see* Lindsey.

Macclesfield (Macclesfeld), Chesh., 38-41 ; Mayor of, *see* Alcock, Roger.
Magna Lymbergh, *see* Limber, Great.
Mainwaring (Maynwaring), John, kt., 64 ; family, 67.
Maisterson, John, 46.
Malmarton', *see* Mammerton.
Malpas, Chesh., 67.
Mammerton (Malmarton'), Derb., 93n.
Manchester, Lanc., 136n., 149, 162-166.
Manley Wapentake, Linc., 185n., 242-243.
Markby (Markeby), Linc., 272n.
Martin, Linc., 263n.
Marton (Poulton-le-Fylde par.), Lanc., 159n.
Maxey, Ntht., 287.
May, Sir John, 275 ; dame Mary, 275.
Maynwaring, *see* Mainwaring.
Meales, *see* Meolse.
Meathley(e), *see* Methley.
Meller, Mr., 223.
Mendlesham (Mendylsham), Suff., 297n., 301-302.
Meolse (Meales, Miall'), Chesh., 27n., 67.
Methley (Meathley(e), Metheley), Yorks., 329-332.
Miall', *see* Meolse.
Middleton, Lanc., 182.
Middleton, Suff., manor of Austin's in, 303.
Middleton Quernhow (Midelton), Yorks., 325n.
Miles, John, 282.
Millard, Mr., 223.
Misson (Misne), Linc. and Nott., 185n.
Mobberley (Moberley), Chesh., 34, 36n.
Mollington Banastre (Mollington Banester), Chesh., 27n.
Moneslowe, *see* Munslow.
Monkton Deverill (Mounton Deverell), Wilts., 323n.
Moorby (Morebie), Linc., 272n.
Moore, Jonas, 254.
Moorside (Moore-side, -syde), Northenden, Chesh., 14n., 48n., 49n., 50n., 51-53.
Morebie, *see* Moorby.
Moreton (Morton) in Wirral, Chesh., 27n.
Moreton, Great, Chesh., 42-43.
Morris, John, 275.
Morton, *see* Moreton in Wirral, Chesh.
Morton, Derb., 105n.
Moston, Lanc., 136n., 164, 167.
Motcombe, Dors., 117.
Mottram in Longdendale, Chesh., 44-45 ; Rectory, 45.
Mounton Deverell, *see* Monkton Deverill.
Muchland (Furness), Lanc., manor of, 152.
Mumby, Linc., 244.
Mumby (Mumbey) Chapel, in Mumby par., Linc., 244.
Munslow (Moneslowe), Salop, 4n.

Nacton, Suff., 297n.
Nantwich (Wychmalbank), Chesh., 46-47, 67.
Naseburgh', Philip de, 279.
Neile, Sir Paul, 276.
Nerther Ellington, *see* Ellington, Nether.
Newcomen, Robert, 225.
Neweton Sulny, *see* Newton Solney.
Newsham, Yorks., 325n.
Newton, Chesh., 76.
Newton (Manchester), Lanc., 136n., 163-164.
Newton in Makerfield (Newton), Lanc., 135n., 138n.
Newton Solney (Neweton Sulny), Derb., 101-102.
Nicholas, Mr., 118.
Nocton, Linc., 245.
Noctorum (Knoktirum'), Chesh., 30.
Norbury, Chesh., 137n.
Norbury Booths (Norbury Bothes), *see* Knutsford, Over.
Norcliffe, Chesh., 12.
Norfolk, 277-285.
Normanton, Derb., 105n.
Northallerton, Yorks., 333.
Northamptonshire, 286-288.
Northenden (Northen, Northerden), Chesh., 14n., 48-61.
Northorpe (Northrope), Linc., 185n.
Northroade, Northrode, *see* Rode, North.
Northrope, *see* Northorpe.
Norton in Hales (Norton in Halez), Salop, 4n.
Notehurst, *see* Nuthurst.
Nottinghamshire, 289-290.
Nuthurst (Notehurst), in Manchester par., Lanc., 148, 149n.
Nutshaw (Nuttshaw) (Hapton), Lanc., 134n.

Odd Rode, Chesh., 43n.
Ogles, Sir Thomas, 270.
Ollerton (Olerton, Owlerton), Chesh., 34, 36n., 62, 67.
Orby (Oreby), Linc., 105n., 246-249.
Orford, Lanc., 135n., 137n.
Ormsby, North *or* Nun, Linc., 250.
Ormskirk (Ormyskyrke), Lanc., 173n.
Osberton (Osbarton), Nott., 290.
Osgerby Daris, Linc., 191.
Oswestry, Salop, 291.
Ouresby, *see* Owersby.

Overpever, *see* Peover, Over.
Owersby (Ouresby), Linc., 186n.
Owlerton, *see* Ollerton.
Owmby (Owmebye), Linc., 186n.

Pannington (Panington) Hall, Suff., manor of, *see under* Wherstead.
Panton, Linc., 251.
Parker, Mr., 154.
Parr, Lanc., 135n., 137n.
Paxton, Great, Hunts., 130.
Peacock, Edward, 185-186, 189, 193, 204, 216, 236-237, 242-243, 259, 264, 271 ; Mrs. 237.
Pemberton, Lanc., 135n.
Pendle, Lanc., 134n., 146.
Pendlebury, Lanc., 136n., 179.
Pendleton (Whalley par.), Lanc., 146 and notes.
Pennington (Penyngton), Lanc., 173n.
Pensby, Chesh., 27n.
Penwortham, Lanc., 160, 168-172.
Penyngton, *see* Pennington.
Peover, Over (Overpever, Pe(o)ver), Chesh., 63-70.
Peterborough, Ntht., Dean and Chapter of, 288.
Phillipot, William, 289.
Pickworth, Linc., 252-253.
Picot, Thomas, 282.
Pierpoint, Henry, kt., 89, 91, 93, 101.
Pilham, Linc., 185n.
Pilsley (Pyllysley), Derb., 105n.
Pinchbeck (Pinchbacke), Linc., 270n.
Pincombe, John, 106 ; John, s. John, 106.
Pinxton (Pynkeston'), Derb., 105n.
Plain Furness, Lanc., 150.
Plumley, Chesh., 20n., 67.
Pointon (Poynton), Linc., 254-255, 260.
Pole, Peter, 94.
Poulton Lancelyn (Pulton, Pulton Lancelett), Chesh., 27n., 67.
Poulton-le-Fylde (Poulton, Pulton'), Lanc., 159n., 173n.
Poulton with Fearnhead, Lanc., 135n.
Poundswick (Pounsacke), Etchells, Chesh., 14n.
Powys, Edward, 43.
Poynton, *see* Pointon, Linc.
Preston, Lanc., 173-176.
Preston-under-Scar (Preston), Yorks., 325n.
Prestwich, Lanc., 177, 179.
Pulton, *see* Poulton Lancelyn, Chesh. ; Poulton-le-Fylde, Lanc.
Pulton Lancelett, *see* Poulton Lancelyn.
Pyllysley, *see* Pilsley.
Pynkeston', *see* Pinxton.

Quedgeley, Glouc., 125-126.

Rainow, Chesh., 41n.
Raven, James, 211.
Raydon, Suff., 297n.
Redbourne (Redburne), Linc., 243n.
Reddish, Lanc., 177-179.
Reddish, John, 177-178 ; Margaret, 177.
Redmire (Rydmer), Yorks., 325n.
Richard, John, son of, 290.
Rigby, Sir Alexander, 159.
Rivers Hall (Boxted), Essex, manor of, 123.
Rochdale (Roch Dale), Lanc., 180-182.
Roddesley, *see* Rodsley.
Rode, North (Northroade, Northrode), Chesh., 4n., 76.
Rodsley (Roddesley), Derb., 93n.
Rooe, Mr., 200.
Rosliston, Derb., 103.
Rostherne (Rosthern), 36n.
Rothwell, Linc., 186n.
Rowston, Linc., 186n.
Runcorn, Chesh., 71.
Ruskington, Linc., 256.
Rydmer, *see* Redmire.
Ryley, William, 89, 91, 93, 101.

St. Neots, Hunts., 131.
Salford, Lanc., 136n., 163n.
Sankey, Great (Sankey), Lanc., 135n.
Saperton, Thomas, 89, 91, 93, 101.
Saughall, Chesh., 27n.
Saxby, Linc., 185n.
Scampton, Linc., 257.
Scotter, Linc., 258-259.
Scrope, John Le, 325.
Scunthorpe, Linc., 242n., 243n.
Searby (Seirebye), Linc., 186n.
Sempringham, Linc., 260.
Shack, Ed., 163.
Shadow Moss (Shadow Mosse), Northenden, Chesh., 14n.
Sharston, Chesh., 14n., 49n., 50n.
Sherard, Lord, 244.
Shirley, Derb., 93n.
Shotwick Park (Shotwicke Parke), Chesh., 27n.
Shrigley, Thomas, 39n.
Shropshire, 4, 291-293.
Smallwood, Chesh., 43n.
Smedley (Cheetham), Lanc., 183.
Smith, Sir John, 139-141.
Snelson (Snelston), Chesh., 62.
Snoreham, Essex, 124.
Snowden Grange, Linc., 263n.
Somersham, Suff., 297n.
Soss Moss, Chesh., 7n.
South, Mr., 233.
Southwyllyngham, *see* Willingham, South.
Spalding, Linc., 261.
Spalding Croyland [in Spalding], Linc., manor of, 270n.
Spital (Spittelle), Chesh., 27n.
Spittal (Spitell), Linc., 185n.
Spittelle, *see* Spital, Chesh.

Spotland (Rochdale par.), Lanc., 136n., 156. 180n., 181n.
Sproughton (Sprowton), Suff., 297n.
Squyer, Scipio Le, 291n.
Staffordshire, 294-296.
Stallingborough (Stallingbrough), Linc., 186n.
Stanford in the Vale, Berks., 2.
Stanley, Staff., 27n.
Stanley, Sir John Thomas, 7; Margaret (dau, John Maisterson), 46; Sir Rowland, 27, 79-80; Thomas, s. Margaret, 46.
Stewkeley, Adlard, 220.
Stockport (Stopford), Chesh., 49n., 50n., 72.
Stoke, Chesh., 67, 73.
Stopford, *see* Stockport.
Storeton, Great and Little (Stourton Magna et Parva), Chesh., 27n.
Stretton, Chesh., 7n.
Styal, Chesh., 74.
Sudlow, Chesh., 36n.
Suffolk, 297-312.
Surrey, 313-319.
Sussex, 320-321.
Sussex, Thomas, Earl of, 228.
Sutton, Chesh., 76.
Sutton, Derb., 104.
Sutton, Linc., 262.
Sutton, Little (Sutton Parva) [in Sutton Veny], Wilts., manor of, 323n.
Sutton Frene, Heref., 127.
Sutton Howgrave (Sutton Holgrave), Yorks., 325n.
Sutton Parva, *see* Sutton, Little.
Swaby, Linc., 195.
Swallow (Swallowe), Linc., 186n.
Swanwick (Swanwik), in Norbury, Chesh., 67.
Swaton, Linc., 260.

Tabley Superior (*or* Over), Chesh., 20n.
Tallington, Linc., 268.
Tattershall, Linc., 263.
Tattershall Thorpe, Linc., 263n.
Tattingstone (Tattingston) Farm, Suff., 100n.
Tatton, Robert, 5, 48, 83; Thomas, 15; William, 59; family, 57-58.
Taylor, Mr., 239.
Tetlow (Broughton and Cheetham), Lanc., 179.
Thacker, Gilbert, 112-113.
Thanet, Margaret, Countess Dowager of, 321.
Thingwall, Chesh., 27n.
Thorington Hall, Suff., manor of, *see under* Wherstead.
Thorleston, *see* Thurlston.
Thornbrough (Thornbarghe), Yorks., 325n.
Thornton, Linc., 186n.
Thornton-on-Humber, Linc., Abbey of, 193, 264.
Thornton Rust, Yorks., 325n.
Thornton Steward (Thornton Stewarde), Yorks., 325n.
Thorold (Sir) William, 209, 231-232.
Thorpe Tilney *alias* Timberland Thorpe, Linc., 265.
Threckingham, Linc., 260.
Thurlston (Thorleston, Thurlestone), Suff., 297n., 298n.
Thurstaston, Chesh., 75.
Thurvaston, Derb., 104.
Thynne, Sir John, 323.
Tilston, Chesh., 7n.
Timberland, Linc., 266.
Timberland Thorpe, *see* Thorpe Tilney.
Tirwhitt, Francis, 234. *See also* Tyrwhit(t).
Toft, Chesh., 67.
Toft next Newton (Toftnewton), Linc., 186n.
Tottington, Lanc., 146 and notes.
Towneley (Townley), Charles, 133; family, 132, 134, 156.
Trafford, Edmund, 78.
Tranmere (Tranmull'), Chesh., 27n.
Trawden, Lanc., 146.
Trimley (Tremley), Suff., 297n.
Tunstall, Staff., 295.
Tupholme, Linc., 267.
Turton, Lanc., 136n., 173n.
Twemlow, Chesh., 88.
Tyrwhit(t), Sir Robert, 186; Sir William, 222. *See also* Tirwhitt.

Uckerby, Yorks., 325n.
Uffington, Linc., 268.
Ufflete, Elizabeth, 103; Gerard, kt., 103.
Ulceby, Linc., 186n., 272n.
Upton, Chesh., 27n., 67.
Urchfont, Wilts., 324.

Vernon, Richard, 42.

Waddingham, Linc., 242n., 243n.
Wadley (Great Faringdon), Berks., 1.
Wadsworth, Nicholas, 155.
Wainfleet, Linc., 269.
Wakefield, Yorks, 334.
Wales, Charles, Prince of, 236.
Wallasey (Walezey), Chesh., 27n.
Walton, Lanc., *see* Walton le Dale.
Walton, Som., 323n.
Walton, Suff., 297n.
Walton le Dale (Walton), Lanc., 173n.
Warbreck (Bispham par.), Lanc., 159n.
Wardleworth [Mr.] R., 44.
Warmingham (Warmyncham, Warmyngeham), Chesh., 4n., 76.
Warrington, Lanc., 135n., 137n.
Wartonn, *see* Wharton.
Warwickshire, 322.
Washbrook (Wasbroke), Suff., 297n.

Wavertree, Lanc., 184.
Wealey, *see* Whaley.
Welbye, Elizabeth, *see* Hildyard ; Henry, 187.
Well, Linc., 188.
Wem, Salop, 292.
Wemisforde [? Som. *or* Wilts.], 323n.
Wensley (Wenslay), Yorks., 325n.
Wenyngton, *see* Winnington.
Werstede, *see* Wherstead.
Westerfield (Westerfeld), Suff., 297n.
West Hall (in Ruskington), Linc., manor of, 256.
Westleigh (Westley), Lanc., 173n.
Westwodlandes, *see* Woodlands, West.
Wethyngton, Old, *see* Withington, Old.
Whaddon, Glouc., 126.
Whaley (Wealey), *see* Yeardsley cum Whaley.
Wharton (Wartonn), Chesh., 77.
Wheelock, Chesh., 43n.
Wherstead (Werstede, Whersted), Suff., 100n., 297n., 298n., 304-312 ; manor of, 310, 312 ; Bourn Hall (Borenehall) manor in, 100, 298n., 304, 306-311 ; Pannington (Panington) Hall manor in, 100, 298n. ; Thorington Hall manor in, 305 ; Wherstead Hall Farm, 100.
Whetewell', *see* Whitwell, Derb.
Whisterfield (Whysturfyld), near Siddington, Chesh., 67.
Whitbourne (Whitteborne), Wilts. 323n.
Whitchurch, Salop, 293.
Whitteborne, *see* Whitbourne.
Whittington, Staff., 296.
Whitton (Whittyn), Linc., 186n.
Whitwell (Whetewell', Whitwoll'), Derb., 89n., 105n.
Whitwell, Yorks., 325n.
Whitwood, Yorks., 335.
Whysturfyld, *see* Whisterfield.
Wighton, Norf., 285.
Wigmore (Wyggemore), Heref., 128.
Wilksby (Wilkesby), Linc., 272n.
Willaston, Chesh., 76.
Willingham, South (Southwyllyngham), Linc., 105n.
Willoughby, Linc., 270.
Willoughby, Francis, Lord Willoughby of Parham, 202, 219.
Wilmslow (Wilmeslowe), Chesh., 78.
Wiltshire, 323-324.
Winchester, Hants., Abbey of St. Mary, 324.
Winford, Som., 323n.
Wingerworth (Wyngurworth'), Derb., 105n.
Wingfield, North (North Wynfeld'), Derb., 105.
Winnington (Wenyngton), Chesh., 67.
Winston (Wynston), Yorks., 325n.
Winterton (Wyntertton), Linc., 185n., 242n., 243n., 271.
Wirral, Hundred of, Chesh., 79-80.
Withington, Lower, Chesh., 88.
Withington, Old (Old Wethyngton, Wythyngton), Chesh., 64, 65n., 67, 81-82.
Withinshaw(e), *see* Wythenshawe.
Witnesham (Wyttylsham), Suff., 297n.
Wodechurch, *see* Woodchurch.
Wollaston (Wolaston), Salop, 4n.
Wollridge, John, 115.
Woodbank (Woodbancke), Chesh., 27n.
Woodchurch (Wodechurch, Woodechurche), Chesh., 27n., 30.
Wood Enderby (Woodenderby), Linc., 272n.
Woodhouse Lane, Northenden, Chesh., 14n.
Woodlands, West (Westwodlandes), in Frome Hundred, Som., manor of, 323n.
Woodthorpe, Linc., 272.
Wootton (Wotton), Linc., 186n.
Worsthorne, Lanc., 134n.
Worston, Lanc., 146 and notes.
Wotton, *see* Wootton.
Wowere, Richard, 282.
Wragby, Linc., 273-274.
Wychmalbank, *see* Nantwich.
Wyggemore, *see* Wigmore.
Wykes (in Donington), Linc., manor of, 212, 275.
Wynfeld', North, *see* Wingfield, North.
Wyngurworth', *see* Wingerworth.
Wynston, *see* Winston.
Wyntertton, *see* Winterton.
Wythenshawe (Withinshaw(e), Wythynshawe), Chesh., 5, 48n., 49n., 83-84.
Wythyngton, *see* Withington, Old.
Wythynshawe, *see* Wythenshawe.
Wyttylsham, *see* Witnesham.

Yaddlethorpe (Yadlethorpe), Linc., 242n., 243n.
Yayton, *see* Eaton.
Yeardsley cum Whaley (Yeardesley, Wealey), Chesh., 41n., 85-88.
Yorkshire, 325-335.

BULLETIN

OF

THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

VOLUME 32